Efficacy of Passive Sampler Collection for Atmospheric NO$_2$ Isotopes under Simulated Environmental Conditions
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RATIONALE: Nitrogen oxides or NO\(_x\) (NO\(_x\) = NO + NO\(_2\)) play an important role in air quality, atmospheric chemistry, and climate. The isotopic compositions of anthropogenic and natural NO\(_2\) sources are wide-ranging, and they can be used to constrain sources of ambient NO\(_2\) and associated atmospheric deposition of nitrogen compounds. While passive sample collection of NO\(_2\) isotopes has been used in field studies to determine NO\(_x\) source influences on atmospheric deposition, this approach has not been evaluated for accuracy or precision under different environmental conditions.

METHODS: The efficacy of NO\(_2\) passive sampler collection for NO\(_2\) isotopes was evaluated under varied temperature and relative humidity (RH) conditions in a dynamic flux chamber. The precision and accuracy of the filter NO\(_2\) collection as nitrite (NO\(_2^-\)) for isotopic analysis were determined using a reference NO\(_2\) gas tank and through inter-calibration with a modified EPA Method 7. The bacterial denitrifier method was used to convert 20 µM of collected NO\(_2^-\) or nitrate (NO\(_3^-\)) to N\(_2\)O and was carried out on an Isoprime Continuous Flow Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrometer.

RESULTS: δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) values determined from passive NO\(_2\) collection, in conditions of 11-34 °C, 1-78% RH, have an overall accuracy and precision of ±2.1 ‰, and individual run precision of ±0.6 ‰. δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values obtained from passive NO\(_2\) sampler collection, in the same conditions, have an overall precision of ±1.3 ‰.

CONCLUSIONS: Suitable conditions for passive sampler collection of NO\(_2\) isotopes are in environments ranging from 11-34 °C and 1-78% RH. The passive NO\(_2\) isotope measurement technique provides an accurate method to determine variations in atmospheric δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) values and a precise method for determining atmospheric δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values. The ability to measure NO\(_2\) isotopes over spatial gradients at the same temporal resolution provides a unique perspective on the extent and seasonality of fluctuations in atmospheric NO\(_2\) isotopic compositions.
Nitrogen oxides (NO + NO\textsubscript{2} = NO\textsubscript{x}) play an important role in local and regional atmospheric chemistry, air quality, and climate.\textsuperscript{[1,2]} NO\textsubscript{x} is a precursor to tropospheric ozone (O\textsubscript{3}) through the photodissociation (≤ 400 nm) of NO\textsubscript{2} to both NO and a ground state oxygen [O(\textsuperscript{3}P)].\textsuperscript{[2-4]} The O(\textsuperscript{3}P) atom is able to react with atmospheric oxygen (O\textsubscript{2}) to produce O\textsubscript{3} in the atmosphere. This is especially prevalent in areas of high NO\textsubscript{x} concentrations,\textsuperscript{[5]} which can then create public health issues as NO\textsubscript{x} and O\textsubscript{3} are harmful to the respiratory systems of children and asthmatic individuals.\textsuperscript{[6,7]} In addition, an excited oxygen atom [O(\textsuperscript{1}D)] is produced through O\textsubscript{3} photolysis (< 310 nm), which can react with water vapor (H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{(g)}) in the troposphere, or hydronium ions (H\textsubscript{3}O\textsuperscript{+}) in dense gas, to form the hydroxyl radical (·OH).\textsuperscript{[4,8]} The formation of ·OH has important implications for the production of nitric acid (HNO\textsubscript{3}), which can deposit back to the Earth’s surface and lead to water quality degradation, acidification of soils, and the eutrophication of waterways.\textsuperscript{[9]}

Anthropogenic sources of NO\textsubscript{x}, such as vehicles, power plants, and other industrial processes, account for nearly 85% of the NO\textsubscript{x} emissions inventory in the contiguous United States.\textsuperscript{[10]} Natural sources of NO\textsubscript{x} (e.g. microbial processes, lightning) are also significant NO\textsubscript{x} emissions sources,\textsuperscript{[11,12]} but large uncertainties for these sources currently exist in the nationwide NO\textsubscript{x} emission inventory, ranging from ± 20 to 50%.\textsuperscript{[9,12]} The conservation of the nitrogen atom between NO\textsubscript{x} sources and sinks allows for the determination of NO\textsubscript{x} source apportionments to ecosystems using δ\textsuperscript{15}N signatures. The δ\textsuperscript{15}N value of NO\textsubscript{x} from anthropogenic and natural sources have recently become more widely documented and span a large range (-49 to +26 ‰), depending on the NO\textsubscript{x} emission source.\textsuperscript{[13-23]} In addition, recent experimental and modeling efforts have focused on determining kinetic and equilibrium isotope fractionation associated with the tropospheric oxidation of NO\textsubscript{x} to nitrate (NO\textsubscript{3}-) to facilitate tracing the land-atmosphere reactive NO\textsubscript{x} cycle using δ\textsuperscript{15}N signatures.\textsuperscript{[24-26]} To date, the δ\textsuperscript{15}N values of NO\textsubscript{x} and depositional NO\textsubscript{3}⁻ have been used to estimate NO\textsubscript{x}
emissions sources’ contribution to dry and wet NO$_3^-$ deposition,[27–32] historical nitrogen deposition in lake and ice cores,[33–35] and plants’ nutrient sourcing.[19,22,36]

A variety of measurement techniques have been used to determine the δ$^{15}$N values of both NO$_x$ sources and ambient NO$_2$, including denuder tubes coated with NaOH/Guaiacol or KOH/Guaiacol,[19,20,26] active bubbler collections (NO, NO$_2$, or NO$_x$) that utilize triethanolamine (TEA), NaOH/KMnO$_4$, NaOH/H$_2$O$_2$, or H$_2$SO$_4$/H$_2$O$_2$ absorbing solutions,[15,16,18,37] and passive diffusion samplers.[17,38,39] Each isotope collection technique has its own benefits or limitations. In particular, NO$_2$(g) diffusion samplers create a concentration gradient between ambient air and air inside the tube. As NO$_2$(g) diffuses through physical barriers, such as diffusive caps or screens, ambient NO$_2$(g) is then adsorbed to a filter impregnated with NO$_2$(g) collection solutions such as TEA or NaI/NaOH solutions. Filters are then eluted with deionized water to collect NO$_2^-(aq)$ ions in solution for subsequent concentration and isotopic analyses.[17,38] In a pioneering study, Redling et al. utilized isotope mixing models on passively collected NO$_2$(g) to determine source apportionment from a variety of sources, with the assumption that NO$_x$(g) quickly oxidized to NO$_2$(g) over short spatial gradients away from mobile sources.[38] Felix et al. examined variations in δ$^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values with sampler deployment height, deployment length, and in areas with different NO$_x$ sources (e.g., livestock, vehicles, etc.) using Ogawa NO$_2$(g) samplers.[17] In another study, Dahal and Hastings in a study of δ$^{15}$N-NO$_2$ and δ$^{15}$N-NO$_x$ values determined from passive sampler collection concluded that: 1) the values are indicative of a mixture of sources, 2) collection of NO$_2$(g) isotopes may not necessarily be equivalent to NO$_x$(g) isotopes from sources, and 3) passive samplers have a precision of < 1‰ amongst samples.[40]
Although passive sampler collection of NO$_2$(g) has been shown to be a robust tool for evaluating $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ fluctuations and NO$_x$ source mixing,\textsuperscript{[38,40]} a quantitative assessment of the accuracy and precision associated with the filter collection and subsequent $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ analysis is still lacking. Previous investigations focusing on NO$_2$(g) concentration analysis have identified ambient temperature, relative humidity (referred to as RH for the rest of the paper), and wind speed as the key factors affecting the NO$_2$(g) uptake efficiency of passive samplers.\textsuperscript{[41]} For example, RH has been found to be the most important environmental factor influencing the effective sampling rate of passive NO$_2$(g) samplers due to the inefficiency of TEA as an absorbent at low relative humidities.\textsuperscript{[42-44]} However, it is currently unknown if changes in the NO$_2$(g) uptake efficiency induced by varying environmental conditions can cause fractionation of NO$_2$(g) isotopes during passive NO$_2$(g) collection. Since passive samplers are distinctive monitoring tools that can be deployed in multiple locations to collect NO$_2$(g) with desirable temporal resolution, it is vital to determine whether varying environmental conditions influence the $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values determined by using passive samplers.

In this study, the efficacy of the Ogawa passive sample collection for NO$_2$(g) isotopes was evaluated under varying simulated conditions in a dynamic flux chamber. The precision and accuracy of the $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ analysis were determined using a reference NO$_2$(g) tank and through inter-calibration with a modified EPA Method 7 originally designed for stationary NO$_x$ sources. The results of this study have important implications for NO$_2$(g) isotope collection methods because of the passive sampler method’s simplicity, inexpensiveness, and time-integrated collection of NO$_2$(g) isotopes.
Materials and Methods

Ogawa Filter Assembly

Passive samplers are effective for determining ambient air concentrations of nitrogen-containing molecules (e.g. NO$_2$(g), NH$_3$(g), HNO$_3$(g)), are inexpensive, require little maintenance, and do not require electricity.\cite{27,38,45-48} In particular, the Ogawa passive sampler body (Ogawa & Company, Pompano Beach, FL, USA) consists of a double-sided passive diffusion design with diffusion end caps on both sides, followed by a stainless steel screen, a 14.5 mm cellulose filter impregnated with a 10% TEA adsorbing solution, followed by another stainless steel screen, and then a retainer ring. In addition, the sampler bodies are covered by an opaque, plastic shelter to prevent influence from the sun or rainfall.

Ogawa Fractionation Tests

A cylindrical dynamic flux chamber (15 cm height and 18 cm inner diameter) was used to simulate varying environmental conditions and the potential influence on the collection of NO$_2$(g) isotopes onto the Ogawa passive samplers (Fig. 1). The chamber was made of 5 mm thick transparent acrylic plastic and lined with 0.05 mm thick Teflon film. A low-speed electric fan was installed inside the chamber to aid in air mixing. The air temperature and RH in the chamber headspace were continuously measured using an Onset HOBO sensor (Onset Computer Corporation®, Bourne, MA, USA) at 1 min intervals. A NIST-traceable reference gas tank containing 104.9 ppmv NO$_2$(g) balanced in air (Matheson, Montgomeryville, PA, USA) was connected to the flux chamber via 0.25 inch Teflon tubing and the flow rate was controlled using a mass flow controller [0-200 standard cubic centimeters per minute (SCCM), SmartTrak 50, Sierra Instruments, Monterey, CA, USA] (Figure 1). A zero-air flow free of NO$_x$(g), O$_3$(g), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) was produced by passing a pressurized ambient air flow through columns of activated carbon and
Purafil® and was controlled by a mass flow controller [0-10 standard liters per minute (SLPM), SmartTrak 50, Sierra Instruments, Monterey, CA, USA] to dilute the NO$_2(g)$ flow to desired NO$_2(g)$ concentrations (Fig. 1). Wind velocity and air flow were measured inside the chamber using a HOBO wind speed sensor (Onset Computer Corporation) and a Pyle PMA90 digital anemometer (Pyle Audio Inc., Brooklyn, NY, USA), but were not detectable at the instruments’ accuracy resolution.

The environmental conditions simulated in this study included varied temperature and RH levels and are summarized in Table 1. All experiments were conducted in dark conditions in order to prevent UV light interaction with NO$_2(g)$, which could result in NO$_2(g)$ dissociating to NO$_(g)$. The temperature and RH could be controlled at a high sensitivity in the experimental design so three different levels of temperature and RH were designated: low, moderate, and high. Low temperature levels were designated as 10-13 °C, moderate was 22-23 °C, and high was 33-34 °C. Low RH conditions were designated as < 5%, moderate was 20-70%, and high was > 70%. The chamber temperature was varied either by heating the chamber exterior using a self-limiting heating cable or by placing the chamber into a refrigerator during sample collection. To vary the RH in the chamber headspace, the zero-air flow was forced to pass through either a drierite column, to remove moisture, or a 500-mL gas washing bottle containing 250 mL deionized water, to create moisture, before the zero-air and NO$_2(g)$ flows were mixed. Moderate temperature and RH conditions were based on ambient laboratory conditions and did not utilize a control method (e.g. heating coil, refrigerator, drierite column, or gas washing bottle). The Teflon tubing was flushed with inert N$_2(g)$ prior to sample collection in order to remove any impurities within the tubing system.
Ogawa passive samplers were deployed inside the flux chamber in replicate (2 samplers, 4 filters) for 7 separate sample collections and were covered by an opaque shelter to simulate field deployment setup. Two laboratory blanks were collected on the same day as the experiments. Little to no NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)} ($< 0.02$ mg L$^{-1}$ NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)}) was present on all laboratory blanks. The samplers were deployed for 12 hours inside the flux chamber under simulated temperature, RH, and NO$_2$\textsubscript{(g)} concentration conditions. Upon collection completion, individual filters were removed from the passive sampler, transferred to a polyethylene sampling vial (Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA), and were then stored at -20°C until subsequent concentration and isotopic analyses.

**Concentration analyses and ppbv calculation**

Filters were eluted with 5 mL of 18.2 MΩ MilliQ (EMD MilliPore Corporation, Kankakee, IL, USA) water to produce NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)} ions. Filter eluent concentrations of NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)} were analyzed on a Thermo Evolution 60S UV-Visible Spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Skokie, IL, USA). Theoretical [NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)}] (mg L$^{-1}$) calculations were back-calculated for each experiment using a temperature and RH dependence equation developed by Ogawa & Company.$^{[49]}$

$$\text{Eq. 1} \quad [\text{NO}_2\textsubscript{(aq)}] = \frac{([\text{NO}_2\textsubscript{(g)}])_v^t}{(10,000 / (0.677\times P \times RH) + (2.009 \times T) + 89.8)} \times \frac{1 \text{ mg}}{1,000,000 \text{ ng}} \times \frac{E}{1 \text{ L}} \times \frac{1000 \text{ mL}}{1 \text{ L}} \times V_C$$

where [NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)}]$_t$ is the theoretical NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)} concentration (mg L$^{-1}$) eluted from a filter, \([\text{NO}_2\textsubscript{(g)}]_v\) is the NO$_2$\textsubscript{(g)} concentration (ppbv) in the chamber, \(t\) is the time of filter exposure (minutes), \(P\) is a dimensionless vapor pressure coefficient corresponding to a temperature,$^{[49]}$ RH is the average RH inside the chamber (%), \(T\) is the average temperature inside the chamber (°C), \(E\) is the elution volume (5 mL), and \(V_C\) is a stoichiometric conversion that is used to convert the NO$_2$\textsubscript{(aq)} measured in the total solution to the initial solution to adjust for
reagent volume addition. Collection efficiencies were then calculated for each experiment by comparing the measured $[\text{NO}_2^-_{(aq)}]$ with the theoretical concentrations.

*Reference Gas Tank Collection using Modified EPA Method 7*

A modified version of the US EPA Method 7 (Determination of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Stationary Sources) was utilized to collect NO$_2(g)$ from the 104.9 ppmv NO$_2(g)$ gas tank (hereafter referred to as the reference gas tank). This method has been described in detail by Walters et al. and Felix et al. Briefly, samples from the tank were collected in evacuated 1-L borosilicate bulbs (Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA) which were connected to on tubing attached to the reference gas tank. Samplers were collected for approximately 1 minute after which the stopcock connecting the bulb to the tank was closed. The sampling bulbs contained 10 mL of a NO$_x(g)$ absorbing solution, made using 2.8 mL of concentrated sulfuric acid (H$_2$SO$_4$) (Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) and 0.6 mL of 30% hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$) (Sigma Aldrich) which was then diluted to 1 L using 18.2Ω MilliQ water (EMD MilliPore Corporation). The absorbing solution traps NO$_2(g)$ in the form of NO$_2^-(aq)$ then oxidizes it further to NO$_3^-(aq)$, allowing for concentration and isotopic composition analyses. Tank samples were collected in triplicate. After NO$_2(g)$ collection from the tank, the samples were kept in a dark, ambient temperature environment for 1 week with daily shaking to allow for complete oxidation of NO$_2^-(aq)$ to NO$_3^-(aq)$. The headspace of each bulb was subsequently analyzed for any remaining NO$_x(g)$ concentration using a Thermo Environmental Instrument Chemiluminescence i17 NO-NO$_2$–NO$_x$ Analyzer (Thermo Environmental Instrument, Franklin, MA, USA). The remaining headspace in the bulbs was determined to have concentrations of $\leq$ 2.5 ppbv NO$_x(g)$, indicating a $> 99.9\%$ collection efficiency. The absorbing solution was transferred to plastic bottles and neutralized using 1 mL of sodium bicarbonate (NaHCO$_3$) (Sigma Aldrich). Blank samples of
the collection solution were analyzed and yielded no background NO$_3^-(aq)$ presence during the isotopic analyses.

**Isotopic analyses**

Isotopic analyses of NO$_2$ filter eluents and neutralized reference gas tank samples were conducted using the bacterial denitrifier method. 20 nmol of NO$_2^-(aq)$ or NO$_3^-(aq)$ were converted to N$_2O(g)$ utilizing a denitrifying bacteria, *P. aureofaciens*.$^{[51,52]}$ The filter samples were analyzed 3-5 times and reference gas tank samples were analyzed 8 times for $\delta^{15}$N and $\delta^{18}$O values using an Isoprime Trace Gas and Gilson GX-271 autosampler coupled to an Isoprime Continuous Flow Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrometer (Isotope Ltd, Stockport, UK) at the University of Pittsburgh Regional Stable Isotope Laboratory for Earth and Environmental Science Research (Pittsburgh, PA, USA) Nitrogen and oxygen isotope ratios are reported as $\delta$ values in parts per thousand relative to atmospheric N$_2(g)$ and VSMOW (Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water), respectively, as:

$$\text{Eq. 2 } \delta(\%o) = \left(\frac{R_{\text{sample}}}{R_{\text{standard}}} - 1\right)$$

where R denotes the ratio between the heavy and light isotopes (e.g. $^{15}$N/$^{14}$N and $^{18}$O/$^{16}$O). The raw $\delta^{15}$N and $\delta^{18}$O values were corrected using a NO$_2(aq)$ standard, RSIL-20 (USGS-Reston, $\delta^{15}$N-RSIL-20 = -79.6 %o vs air, $\delta^{18}$O-RSIL-20 = +4.5 %o vs VSMOW),$^{[53]}$ the international reference standards USGS-34 and IAEA-N3, and an internal nitrite reference standard ($\delta^{15}$N = -27.4 %o vs air) calibrated by the aforementioned standards and inter-laboratory comparisons. RSIL-20 was used in order to improve the calibration capability for the low $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ tank samples, and to allow for a secondary correction to the $\delta^{18}$O values of nitrite samples calibrated by nitrate standards.$^{[53]}$ This correction was applied to sample $\delta^{18}$O values by subtracting the average measured $\delta^{18}$O-NSIL-20 value from its true value for each run, and then adding the difference to the sample $\delta^{18}$O values.$^{[40,53]}$ The average correction
factor across all isotopic composition analysis runs was $+28.3 \pm 0.5 \% (n = 17)$. Standard replicates had an average standard deviation ($\sigma$) of $\leq 0.25\%$ for $\delta^{15}$N values and $\leq 0.5\%$ for $\delta^{18}$O values.

Statistical analyses

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests, regression analyses, and t tests were conducted in TIBCO Spotfire S+® 8.2. The groupings of filter collections for ANOVA tests were: 1) all filter samples (Tests 1-7, Table 1), 2) moderate T, varying RH conditions (Tests 1-3, Table 1), 3) low T, varying RH conditions (Tests 5 and 7, Table 1), 4) varying T, low RH conditions (Tests 2, 4, and 5, Table 1), 5) varying T conditions, moderate RH (Tests 1, 6, and 7, Table 1), and 6) high T, varying RH conditions (Tests 4 and 6, Table 1). In addition, two sample t tests (assuming unequal variances) were conducted to compare reference gas tank samples against all the groupings used in the ANOVA analyses. An alpha ($\alpha$) level of 0.05 was used for both ANOVA and t tests.

Results and Discussion

Collection Results

The theoretical concentrations for the NO$_2$ (g) collection solution (reference gas tank) were 26.2 ppm NO$_3$ (aq), assuming 100% collection. The NO$_2^-$ (aq) concentration of the filter eluents ranged from 0.92 to 1.1 mg L$^{-1}$ NO$_2$ (aq) with an average of $1.01 \pm 0.06$ mg L$^{-1}$ NO$_2^-$ (aq). The theoretical concentrations back-calculated from the Ogawa protocol ranged from 0.68 to 1.0 mg L$^{-1}$ NO$_2^-$ (aq) with an average of $0.86 \pm 0.11$ mg L$^{-1}$ NO$_2^-$ (aq). The collection efficiency (%) for each environmental condition tested ranged from 106 to 148% with an average of $120 \pm 13\%$. Collection efficiencies in excess of 100% may be due to: 1) inaccuracy in the dimensionless vapor pressure coefficient (P) used in Equation 2 that is
assumed based on temperature, or 2) the Ogawa calculation not being entirely applicable to well-mixed, enclosed settings (e.g., small chambers). Since the laboratory blanks had concentrations (< 0.02 mg L\(^{-1}\) NO\(_2\)\(_{(aq)}\)) near the instrument detection limit, we rule out additional NO\(_2(g)\) collected by sample filters as a potential cause of > 100% collection efficiencies. In addition, given that turbulence was undetectable in the chamber (i.e., turbulence could shorten the total diffusion path), this indicates that higher effective sampling rates from turbulent conditions were not the cause of >100% collection efficiency.\(^{[55]}\)

Together, this suggests that overestimated collection efficiencies are probably due to uncertainty in the theoretical concentration calculation, rather than environmental or contamination factors, which has previously been documented in studies using open NO\(_2(g)\) diffusion tubes.\(^{[55-58]}\)

The \(\delta^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) values determined for the reference gas tank ranged from -39.5 to -40.0 \(^\circ\) (\(n=3\)), with an average of -39.8 ± 0.2 \(^\circ\) (Fig. 2). The average \(\delta^{15}\)N value (-39.8 \(^\circ\)) is hereafter used as the reference gas tank value for comparison against passive filter sample collections. \(\delta^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values could not be definitively determined for the reference gas because of the inability to determine reagent interference magnitude. There is an oxygen addition on the initial NO\(_2(g)\) trapping to NO\(_2\)\(_{(aq)}\) which is then oxidized to NO\(_3\)\(_{(aq)}\) by an oxygen from either H\(_2\)O, H\(_2\)O\(_2\), or H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) in the absorbing solution. This additional oxygen could not be accounted for because blank collection solutions did not yield N\(_2\)O\(_4\) in the vial headspace. The reference gas tank \(\delta^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values were 12.7 ± 0.2 \(^\circ\), but since the additional oxygen \(\delta^{18}\)O value could not be determined, the tank isotope values were not compared with the filter collection values (Fig. 2).\(^{[53]}\)
The δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) values determined from the filter eluents ranged from -36.5 to -42.5 ‰ with an average of -39.5 ± 2.1 ‰ across all simulated environmental conditions (Fig. 2). The δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values determined from the filter eluents ranged from 7.1 to 11.7 ‰ with an average of 9.3 ± 1.3 ‰ across all simulated environmental conditions (Fig. 2).

**Environmental Condition Effects**

Temperature variations had an effect on the concentration collection by passive samplers, but not on isotope collections (Fig. 3). While isotope effects were observed when the temperature was varied, these effects were due to variations in RH rather than to temperature differences. The average [NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\)] collected in varied T (11-33 °C), low RH conditions was 0.97 ± 0.04 mg L\(^{-1}\) NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\). The average [NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\)] collected in varied T (13-34 °C), moderate RH conditions was 1.03 ± 0.06 mg L\(^{-1}\) NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\). There is a significant, negative correlation between the temperature measurements in the chamber and the measured filter NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\) eluent concentrations (Fig. 3). The correlation indicates that higher temperatures are associated with less effective passive sampling rates.

The RH conditions in the chamber had an effect on both concentrations and δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) values (Fig. 3). The average [NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\)] collected in moderate T, varied RH conditions was 1.02 ± 0.07 mg L\(^{-1}\) NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\). In this experiment, the eluent concentration collection efficiencies showed > 100% collection for all environmental conditions, and increasing RH conditions resulted in increased NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\) concentrations (Fig. 3). There is a significant, positive correlation (\(r^2 = 0.71, p < 1 \times 10^{-15}\)) between the RH conditions measured in the chamber and the measured filter eluent [NO\(_2^-\)\(_{(aq)}\)] (Fig. 3). This correlation demonstrates that increasing RH conditions result in higher effective sampling rates.

The average δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) value from filter collections under varied T, low RH conditions was -37.4 ± 0.4 ‰ (n = 9). Under varied T, moderate RH conditions, the average
\( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) value from filter collections was \(-41.5 \pm 1.0 \text{‰} \) (\( n = 10 \)). The average \( \delta^{18}\text{O}-\text{NO}_2 \) value from filter collections under varied T, low RH conditions was \( 10.5 \pm 0.7 \text{‰} \) (\( n = 9 \)). Under varied T, moderate RH conditions, the average \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) value from filter collections was \( 8.2 \pm 0.8 \text{‰} \) (\( n = 10 \)). The reference gas tank \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) values were statistically different from all the varied T passive sampler \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) values, but the passive sampler \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) values were not always statistically different from one another. There was a significant difference (\( p < 0.0001 \) and \( p < 0.05 \) for low RH and moderate RH conditions, respectively) between the average \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) value from the reference gas tank and the average passive sampler \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) value under varied temperatures. In contrast, ANOVA analyses indicated that the \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) values (filter collections under varied T, low RH conditions) did not have a significant difference (\( p = 0.21 \)) amongst each other. The \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) values from passive sampling collections in varied T, moderate RH conditions did, however, show significant differences amongst one another (\( p < 0.0001 \)).

Due to limitations of the experimental setup, the ambient laboratory RH conditions in the chamber could not be precisely controlled when the temperature was varied, so the combined environmental effects occurred during varied T, moderate RH collections. Moderate RH conditions (21-64%) were more widely ranging than low RH conditions (1-3%), and ANOVA analyses of both settings indicate that there was only a significant difference amongst samples when RH was also varied. The lack of a significant temperature effect on both \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) and \( \delta^{18}\text{O}-\text{NO}_2 \) values is also demonstrated by the absence of a correlation between temperature and isotopic compositions (Fig. 3). While there were differences between average \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) values from the reference gas tank and average \( \delta^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2 \) values from filter collections under varied T conditions, these effects were confounded by RH effects rather than being caused by temperature effects.
We observed minor isotopic fractionation (≤ 2.5 ‰) across all RH conditions variations and preferential $^{15}$N diffusion under extreme RH conditions (1.3 and 78%). The average $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ value of filter samples collected in moderate T, varied RH conditions (1.3-77.7%) was -38.4 ± 1.3 ‰ (n = 9). In addition, the average $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ value of filter samples collected in moderate T, varied RH conditions (1.3-77.7%) was 9.8 ± 1.0 ‰ (n = 9). Overall, this indicates that NO$_2$(g) passive samplers perform well under moderate temperatures compared with the reference gas tank (Fig. 2), and indicates a < 1.5 ‰ precision for filter determinations of both $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ values under varied RH conditions. However, the higher standard deviation for the varied RH conditions (± 1.3 ‰) than for the varied T, low RH condition collections (± 0.4 ‰) further demonstrates the RH effect on passive sampler NO$_2$(g) isotope collection. This effect is also suggested by the significant, positive correlation between relative humidity and both $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ values ($r^2 = 0.30-0.31$, p < 0.01, Fig. 3).

The mean $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ value from the reference gas tank was not statistically different from values from filter collections under moderate T, varied RH conditions (p = 0.07). Conversely, ANOVA tests conducted for this grouping (moderate T, varying RH) showed a difference amongst passive sampler $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values (p < .00001). In addition, the p values (ANOVA) were < 0.001 for collections under both high T, varied RH and low T, varied RH conditions. This indicates that the RH conditions influence passive sampler NO$_2$(g) isotope collections because collections under the same temperature, but different RH conditions result in statistically different $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values.

Previous studies have concluded that moisture conditions are the most important environmental factor for the accurate performance of TEA-adsorbent samplers.\textsuperscript{[41]} In low RH conditions, the lack of water vapor may not allow TEA to quantitatively convert trapped NO$_2$(g) to NO$_2^-(aq)$, and it has been confirmed that extremes in RH conditions have an
observable effect on passive sampling rates.\textsuperscript{[41,59]} Decreased RH conditions are probably inhibiting the uptake of NO\textsubscript{2}(g) which results in decreased concentrations, and in turn, leads to variable $\delta^{15}$N-NO\textsubscript{2} values. These results indicate that there is an isotopic fractionation occurring due to RH conditions in the chamber, but combined effects from both temperature and RH conditions are important to consider.

**Combined Effects and Modeled Fractionation Factors**

To better understand the preferential diffusion of NO\textsubscript{2}(g) isotopes, the use of kinetic fractionation factors was explored. To determine the kinetic fractionation factors, an approximate fraction factor was determined using Equation 3:

$$\text{Eq. 3} \quad \Delta = \delta_p - \delta_s$$

where $\Delta$ is the approximate fractionation factor ($\%$), $\delta_p$ is the $\delta^{15}$N-NO\textsubscript{2} value determined from the filter eluent ($\%$), and $\delta_s$ is the $\delta^{15}$N-NO\textsubscript{2} value determined from the reference gas tank ($\%$). Using $\Delta$, a kinetic fractionation factor was determined using Equation 4:

$$\text{Eq. 4} \quad \alpha = \frac{\Delta}{100} + 1$$

where $\alpha$ is the kinetic fractionation factor in terms of the kinetic rate constants (k) between the light N isotope ($^{14}$N) and heavy N isotope ($^{15}$N). There was a diffusive effect on the NO\textsubscript{2}(g) isotopes during sampler uptake for all filter collections in low RH conditions, as the kinetic fractionation factors were $< 1.0$. The kinetic fractionation factors from all filter collections above 1.3% RH were $> 1.0$, except when RH was 78% (0.9995). Under both low and high RH conditions, $^{15}$N was preferentially adsorbed to the filter and converted to NO\textsubscript{2}^- (aq). Due to the lack of water vapor in the chamber at low RH conditions, TEA-coated filters may not quantitatively convert $^{14}$N as effectively as $^{15}$N, and isotopic interactions with water vapor may be influencing collections under high RH conditions. Further exploration into the gaseous diffusion rates of $^{14}$N and $^{15}$N of NO\textsubscript{2}(g) in air, under different RH conditions, would
provide more detail for sampling NO$_2$(g) isotopes, but exploration of these dynamics was beyond the scope of this study.

The $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ values from filter-collected NO$_2$(g) under all environmental conditions were compared against each other and showed a positive, significantly correlated relationship ($r^2 = 0.87$, $p < .00001$, Fig. 4). Kinetic fractionation effects from RH conditions were observed for both NO$_2$(g) isotopes, leading to a strong correlation. The combined environmental effect on NO$_2$(g) isotopes during diffusion processes under different environmental conditions was explored by modeling fractionation factors at a range of environmental conditions. An approximate fractionation factor was determined for every filter $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ value using Equation 3. A multiple regression was then run on approximate fractionation factors from the filter samples using RH and T as independent variables. Turbulence was not used because it could not be converted to a wind speed variable that is applicable for field conditions. The multiple regression had an adjusted $r^2$ of 0.33 ($p < 0.01$) and the resulting equation was:

$$\text{Eq. 5} \quad \Delta_F = -3.423 + 0.045 \times RH_M + 0.081 \times T_M$$

where $\Delta_F$ is the approximate fractionation factor ($\%$), RH$_M$ is the average measured RH ($\%$), and T$_M$ is the average measured temperature ($^{\circ}$C). Using this equation, all combinations of possible RH conditions (0-100%) and all likely temperature conditions ($^{\circ}$C) for sampler deployments (0-40 $^{\circ}$C) were input to determine approximate fractionation factors using different RH/T combinations (Fig. 5). This analysis indicates that likely environmental conditions for passive sampler deployments (average RH of 20-90%, average T of 0-30 $^{\circ}$C) will normally yield $\leq 1-2$ $\%$ fractionations (Fig. 5). Further inter-calibration studies are needed to determine whether field conditions support this evidence.
**Overall Accuracy and Precision**

The average $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values determined from all the filter samples ($n = 21$) are in good agreement with the $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values determined from the reference gas tank ($n = 3$). While there was a statistically significant difference in the mean $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values between the two collection methods, the difference was quantifiable and was attributable to RH variations. Temperature effects on the $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values from filter collections are believed to be minimal and the ~2.0 ‰ accuracy decrease at different temperatures was due to RH condition effects rather than temperature fluctuations. The $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values from filter samples were most accurate ($\leq 0.01\%$ error) under 22-23 °C, 33-78% RH conditions.

Overall, TEA-coated filters provide an accurate and precise method for the quantitative determination of $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values from filters deployed in varied simulated environmental conditions with a $\leq 1-2\%$ fractionation occurring at moderate RH conditions. Although extreme RH conditions can produce a larger isotopic fractionation, areas where passive samplers are likely to be used do not sustain 1% RH conditions (e.g., Death Valley, CA, USA; RH = ~10-50%) and high precipitation areas do not always sustain extremely high RH conditions (e.g., Seattle, WA, USA; ~60-90%).

TEA-coated filters provide a precise method for determining $\delta^{18}\text{O-NO}_2$ values from atmospheric NO$_2$(g). The overall accuracy and precision of the method for $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values are $\leq 2.1\%$, which is comparable with other NO$_x$ isotope collection methods (precision of $\pm 1.5\%$). In addition, the precision of individual filter collections under the same conditions for both $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O-NO}_2$ values is $\leq 0.6\%$, which is near the standard deviation for isotope analysis reference standards ($\leq 0.25\%$ and $\leq 0.5\%$ for $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O-NO}_2$ values, respectively). Experiments conducted under realistic environmental field conditions for filter deployments (average RH of 20-90%, average T of 0-30 °C) had an accuracy and precision of $\leq 1.5\%$ for $\delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_2$ values. The overall precision of the method for $\delta^{18}\text{O-NO}_2$
values is ± 1.3 ‰. We observed environmental effects in the δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) and δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values because of variations in RH conditions and this fractionation should be considered in future studies. Future research should investigate method inter-comparisons between passive samplers and other methods (e.g., denuder tubes or aqueous collection solutions) in field conditions; this will provide further inter-calibration of δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) determination methods.

Conclusion

This study quantitatively evaluates the use of passive Ogawa NO\(_2\)\((g)\) sampler for isotopic composition determination under varied environmental conditions. Experiments conducted under realistic environmental field conditions for filter deployments had an overall accuracy and precision of ≤ 2.1 ‰ for δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) values; individual experiments had a precision of ≤ 0.6 ‰ for δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) values, and an overall precision of ± 1.3 ‰ for δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values. This study provides a proof of concept for this method using highly simulated environments and under well-mixed conditions, provides a quantified accuracy for the method, and provides the first approximation to predict fractionations for subsequent isotope studies using passive samplers. Our results display the potential for minor NO\(_2\)\((g)\) isotope fractionation in environmental conditions with extremely low/high temperatures or relative humidities. Since, however, δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_x\) values from anthropogenic and natural sources are so wide-ranging (-49 to +26 ‰),\(^{113–23}\) these minor fractionations should not have a large effect when determining source apportionments. Future studies into passive sampler determination of δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_2\) and δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_2\) values should investigate low concentration environments and further evaluate inter-comparisons between methods in field conditions, executed over similar temporal resolutions, to further constrain the accuracy and precision of this and other methods.
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Table 1. Environmental conditions tested inside the chamber with corresponding collection dates, collection times (minutes), NO$_2$(g) concentration (ppbv), relative humidity (%), temperature (°C), flow rate [slpm (standard liters per minute)] conditions, and the respective settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Collection Period (minutes)</th>
<th>NO$_2$ Concentration (ppbv)</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Relative Humidity (%)</th>
<th>Flow Rate (slpm)</th>
<th>Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/27/2016</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>23.0 ± 0.3</td>
<td>33.3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Moderate T, Moderate RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/28/2016</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>23.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.3 ± 1.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Moderate T, Low RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/29/2016</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>22.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>77.7 ± 0.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Moderate T, High RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/1/2016</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>32.5 ± 0.8</td>
<td>1.3 ± 1.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>High T, Low RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6/2/2016</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>11.2 ± 1.2</td>
<td>1.3 ± 1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Low T, Low RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/4/2017</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>33.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>20.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>High T, Moderate RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1/5/2017</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>12.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>64.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Low T, Moderate RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Measured filter eluent concentrations, theoretical filter eluent concentrations, and associated data needed to calculate theoretical concentrations. The vapor pressure coefficient (P) used from the Ogawa protocol is denoted by †. \([49]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Chamber NO(_{\text{2(at)}}) Concentration (ppbv)</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Relative Humidity (%)</th>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>P (dimensionless)†</th>
<th>Theoretical Concentration (mg L(^{-1}) NO(_{2}) ((\text{aq})))</th>
<th>Measured Concentration (mg L(^{-1}) NO(_{2}) ((\text{aq})))</th>
<th>Collection Efficiency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate T, Moderate RH</td>
<td>373.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate T, Low RH</td>
<td>373.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate T, High RH</td>
<td>373.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.9587</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High T, Low RH</td>
<td>373.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.7385</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low T, Low RH</td>
<td>417.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1.1794</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High T, Moderate RH</td>
<td>373.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.7198</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low T, Moderate RH</td>
<td>418.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1.1412</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Passive sampler collection setup. An NO$_2$(g) reference gas tank (1) and a vacuum pump (2) were connected to the chamber (6) via Teflon tubing. Passive filter assemblies were placed inside the chamber (6). Zero-air passes through columns (3) to remove NO$_x$(g), O$_3$(g), and VOCs and then passes through a humidity control device (3). Air flow from the reference gas tank and zero-air were controlled by mass flow controllers (4 and 5, respectively). NO$_2$(g) concentrations inside the chamber were analyzed by a chemiluminescence NO-NO$_2$-NO$_x$ Analyzer (Thermo Environmental Instrument, Franklin, MA, USA) (7). Air flow exited the chamber via Teflon tubing through the vent.
Figure 2. Box and whisker plots showing the a) range of $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values measured using Ogawa NO$_2$(g) filters under varying temperature (T) and relative humidity (RH) conditions and b) range of $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ values measured using Ogawa NO$_2$(g) filters under varying temperature (T) and relative humidity (RH) conditions. Black circles with lines represent the median isotope value of filter samples for a particular environmental setting. The solid black line in a) represents the average $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ value determined from the reference gas tank. Dashed lines in a) represent the standard deviation in $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values from the reference gas tank. The dashed line with dots in b) represents the average $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ value obtained from filter tests across all environmental conditions.
Figure 3. Linear regressions between a) average relative humidity in the chamber vs. measured filter eluent NO$_2$-(aq) concentration, b) average temperature in the chamber vs. measured filter eluent NO$_2$-(aq) concentration, c) average relative humidity in the chamber vs. $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values, d) average temperature in the chamber vs. $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values, e) average relative humidity in the chamber vs. $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ values, and f) average temperature in the chamber vs. $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ values. R$_2$ values and p values are also shown. In a) and b), all circle symbols are an average (n = 3-4). In a), c), and e), temperature and flow rates were not held constant. In b), d), and f) relative humidities and flow rates were not held constant.
Figure 4. $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_2$ values vs. $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_2$ values from filter NO$_2$(g) collections. Different environmental conditions are denoted by different symbols and the solid line is the linear regression line.
Figure 5. Approximate fractionation factors of δ^{15}N-NO₂ values at corresponding temperatures and relative humidities. Different intervals of approximate fractionation factors are denoted by the blue to yellow interval scale and the internal red outlined box denotes environmental conditions used in this study.