# **Dynamics-based estimates of decline trend with fine temporal variations in China's**

- 2 PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions
- 3

Zhen Peng<sup>1</sup><sup>†</sup>, Lili Lei<sup>1,2</sup><sup>†</sup>, Zhe-Min Tan<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Meigen Zhang<sup>3\*</sup>, Aijun Ding<sup>1</sup> and Xingxia Kou<sup>4</sup> 4 <sup>1</sup>School of Atmospheric Sciences, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China 5 <sup>2</sup>Key Laboratory of Mesoscale Severe Weather, Ministry of Education, Nanjing University, 6 7 Nanjing 210093, China 8 <sup>3</sup>State Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Boundary Layer Physics and Atmospheric Chemistry, 9 Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100029, China <sup>4</sup>Institute of Urban Meteorology, China Meteorological Administration, Beijing 100089, China 10 11 Corresponding author: Zhe-Min Tan (zmtan@nju.edu.cn) and Meigen Zhang 12 (mgzhang@mail.iap.ac.cn) 13

14

# 15 Abstract

Timely, continuous, and dynamics-based estimates of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions with a high temporal 16 17 resolution can be objectively and optimally obtained by assimilating observed surface PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations using flow-dependent error statistics. The annual dynamics-based estimates of 18 PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission averaged over mainland China for years 2016-2020 without biomass burning 19 emissions are 7.66, 7.40, 7.02, 6.62 and 6.38 Tg, respectively, which are very closed to the values 20 of MEIC. Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in China have consistently decreased of approximately 3% to 21 5% from 2017 to 2020. Significant PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission reductions occurred frequently in regions with 22 large PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. COVID-19 could cause a significant reduction of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in the 23 north China plain and northeast of China in 2020. The magnitudes of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions were greater 24 in the winter than in the summer. PM2.5 emissions show an obvious diurnal variation that varies 25 significantly with the season and urban population. Compared to the diurnal variations of  $PM_{2.5}$ 26

emission fractions estimated based on diurnal variation profiles from US and EU, the estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions are 1.25% larger during the evening, the morning peak is 0.57% smaller in winter and 1.05% larger in summer, and the evening peak is 0.83% smaller. Improved representations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions across time scales can benefit emission inventory, regulation policy and emission trading schemes, particularly for especially for high temporal resolution air quality forecasting and policy response to severe haze pollutions or rare human events with significant socioeconomic impacts.

34

# 35 **1. Introduction**

Anthropogenic emissions have imposed essential influences on the earth system, from 36 hourly air quality and human health to long-time climate and environment. To reduce 37 anthropogenic emissions, the Chinese government has enforced the Clean Air Action (2013) since 38 2013. Studies to date that evaluated the emission controls and understood the climate responses 39 from emission reductions often have used either a fixed meteorology with emission changes or 40 41 vice versa (Li et al., 2019a; Li et al., 2021, Zhai et al., 2021). Estimated emissions from empirical extrapolation were commonly applied to analyze the meteorological-chemical mechanisms and 42 associated social-economic impacts from occasional events like the 2015 China Victory Day 43 Parade and Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic (Wang et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2020; 44 45 Huang et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2021). But to better understand both long-term and short-term influences from emission changes, the continuous, up-to-date, and high temporal-/spatial-46 47 resolution emission estimates with coherent interactions of meteorology and emission changes are needed. 48

49 The complex contributions from energy production, industrial processes, transportation, and residential consumptions have imposed great challenges to accurately estimate the emissions. 50 The emission inventories created by the traditional bottom-up techniques were typically outdated 51 52 from the present day due to the lack of accurate and timely statistics, and often with coarse temporal resolutions from monthly to annual (Zhang et al., 2009; Li et al., 2014; Janssens-53 Maenhout et al., 2015; Zheng et al., 2018). Alternatively, update-to-date emission estimates with 54 high temporal-spatial resolutions could be provided by top-down techniques (Miyazaki et al., 55 2017), but most emissions estimated by top-down techniques were intermittent and analyzed at 56

monthly scale or longer longer (Zhang et al., 2016; Jiang et al., 2017; Qu et al., 2017; Cao et al.,
2018; Müller et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019; Li et al., 2019b; Miyazaki et al., 2020). Moreover,
emissions updated by the top-down techniques based on satellite observations could be insufficient
to capture realistic near-surface characteristics (Li et al., 2019b; Liu et al., 2011; Choi et al., 2020).

61 Given the development of observation networks and advanced data assimilation strategies, timely and dynamics-based emission estimates with high temporal resolution can be achieved by 62 harmonically constraining the atmospheric-chemical model with dense observations of trace gas 63 compounds through an optimal assimilation methodology. The ensemble Kaman smoother (EnKS) 64 65 (Whitaker et al., 2002; Peters et al., 2007; Peng et al., 2015), as a four-dimensional (4D) assimilation algorithm, makes use of chemical observations from past to future to provide an 66 optimal estimate of source emissions, and it can capture the "error of the day" and construct fine 67 emission characteristics with high temporal-spatial resolutions by using short-term ensemble 68 69 forecasts (Kalnay, 2002). Since 2013, the fine particulate matter pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>, particles smaller than 2.5  $\mu$ m in diameter) as the most urgent threat to public health has been persistently decreased, 70 71 and ground-based observations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> have been progressively increased (Huang et al., 2018). Thus by harmonically assimilating dense surface PM2.5 observations into an atmospheric-chemical 72 model through an EnKS, hourly estimates of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission that were continuously cycled for 73 years 2016-2020 are presented in this study. 74

The timely estimated emissions can provide guidance for emission inventories that usually 75 have time lags and emission trading schemes that often require up-to-date source emissions. Based 76 77 on the dynamics-based estimated emissions with harmonic combination of the model and observations, better evaluation of the emission controls and more comprehensive understanding of 78 the consequent climate responses can be obtained. The high temporal-resolution estimated 79 emissions can reveal features of emissions that are absent from the traditional ones with coarse 80 temporal resolutions. Moreover, the timely and dynamics-based emission estimates with high 81 temporal resolution are essential for regional air quality modeling, especially for the occurrence of 82 83 severe haze pollutions associated with timely evaluation for the impact on public health (Attri et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2014; Ji et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021) and events that 84 85 lead to large changes of emissions and significant socioeconomic impacts such as the COVID-19 86 pandemic (Huang et al., 2020; Le et al., 2020).

#### 87 2. Data assimilation and experimental design

The estimate of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission can be successfully constrained by the PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration 88 observations through an ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF; Peng et al., 2017, 2018, 2020). For a 89 retrospective 'reanalysis' mode here, all available PM2.5 concentration observations, including 90 those data collected after the analysis time, can be used. Thus a EnKS, a direct generalization of 91 the EnKF, is applied to incorporate PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration observations both before and after the 92 analysis time, aiming to provide an optimal estimate of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission. In simple words, The 93 94 emissions are updated by current and future observations though EnKS, while the concentrations are updated by current observations though EnKF. Detailed procedures of the EnKS are described 95 in section 2.1. 96

# 97 2.1 An ensemble Kalman smoother to update the source emission

The ensemble priors of source emissions  $e^{f}$  is created by multiplying a scaling factor  $\lambda^{f}$ to the prescribed emission  $e^{P}$  (Peng et al., 2017, 2018, 2020), where the superscript *f* denotes priors. Given a time-invariant  $e^{P}$ , the update of  $e^{f}$  is equivalent to the update of  $\lambda^{f}$ . Due to a time lag, the prior scaling factor at time *t*-1 ( $\lambda_{t-1}^{f}$ ) is updated by chemical observations at time *t* ( $\mathbf{y}_{t}^{c}$ ). At time *t*-1, the prior scaling factor for the *i*<sup>th</sup> member is written as

$$\lambda_{i,t-1}^{f} = \frac{1}{M} \left[ \left( \beta \frac{\mathbf{c}_{i,t-1}^{f}}{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{t-1}^{f}} + 1 - \beta \right) + \sum_{j=t-M}^{t-2} \lambda_{i,j|j+1:t-1}^{a} \right].$$
(1)

103

The first term is the concentration ratio given by the prior of the chemical fields ( $\mathbf{c}_{i,t-1}^{f}$ ) normalized 104 by the ensemble mean ( $\overline{\mathbf{c}}_{t-1}^{f}$ ), where  $\beta$  is an inflation factor used to compensate the insufficient 105 106 ensemble spread (Peng et al., 2017). Through using the concentration ratio, each ensemble member 107 of the source emissions naturally has the spatial correlations given by the chemical fields. The second term is the mean of the posterior scaling factors at previous assimilation cycles, where the 108 superscript a denotes posteriors, M is the length of smoothing, and the subscript i+1:t-1 indicates 109 that the scaling factor at time *j* is updated by future observations from j+1 to t-1. The assimilation 110 111 of future observations will be described below.

112 The ensemble square-root filter (EnSRF) (Peng et al., 2017) is used to update  $\lambda_{t-1}^{f}$  by 113 assimilating  $\mathbf{y}_{t}^{c}$ . For the scaling factor at time *t*-1, posterior ensemble mean is given by

114 
$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{t-1}^{a} = \overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{t-1}^{f} + \rho \circ \mathbf{P}_{t-1,t}^{ec} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c\mathbf{T}} \left( \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{P}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c\mathbf{T}} + \mathbf{R}_{t}^{c} \right)^{-1} \left( \mathbf{y}_{t}^{c} - H_{t}^{c} \overline{\mathbf{c}}_{t}^{f} \right), \qquad (2)$$

and posterior ensemble perturbations are given by

116 
$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,t-1}^{'a} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,t-1}^{'f} - \rho \circ \mathbf{P}_{t-1,t}^{ec} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c\mathbf{T}} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{P}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c\mathbf{T}} + \mathbf{R}_{t}^{c}} \right)^{-1} \right]^{\mathbf{T}} \left[ \sqrt{\left(\mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{P}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c\mathbf{T}} + \mathbf{R}_{t}^{c}\right)} + \sqrt{\mathbf{R}_{t}^{c}} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,t-1}^{'f} ,$$

117 (3)

where  $\mathbf{P}_{t-1,t}^{ec}$  denotes the background error covariance matrix of  $\lambda_{t-1}^{f}$  and  $\mathbf{c}_{t}^{f}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_{t}^{c}$  indicates the background error covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{c}_{t}^{f}$ ,  $H_{t}^{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}_{t}^{c}$  are the observation forward operator, Jacobian matrix and observation error covariance matrix of the chemical fields at time *t*,  $\rho$  is the localization matrix and  $\circ$  denotes the Schur (elementwise) product.

By applying the ensemble Kalman smoother (EnKS) (Whitaker et al., 2002; Peters et al., 2007), the chemical observation  $\mathbf{y}_t^c$  is also assimilated to update the posterior scaling factor at previous assimilation cycles j(j=t-K,...,t-2). After assimilating the future chemical observation at time *t*, posterior ensemble mean of the scaling factor at *j* is given by

126 
$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{j|j+1:t}^{a} = \overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{j|j+1:t-1}^{a} + \rho \circ \mathbf{P}_{j|j+1:t-1,t}^{ec} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{T} \left( \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{P}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c}^{T} + \mathbf{R}_{t}^{c} \right)^{-1} \left( \mathbf{y}_{t}^{c} - \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \overline{\mathbf{c}}_{t}^{f} \right), \qquad (4)$$

127 and posterior ensemble perturbations are given by

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,j|j+1:t}^{'a} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,j|j+1:t-1}^{'a} - \rho \circ \mathbf{P}_{j|j+1:t-1,t}^{ec} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{cT} \left[ \left( \sqrt{\mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{P}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{cT} + \mathbf{R}_{t}^{c}} \right)^{-1} \right]^{T} \left[ \sqrt{\left(\mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{P}_{t}^{c} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{cT} + \mathbf{R}_{t}^{c}\right)} + \sqrt{\mathbf{R}_{t}^{c}} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{t}^{c} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{i,t-1}^{'f}, \quad (5)$$

128

where  $\mathbf{P}_{j|j+1:t-1,t}^{ec}$  denotes the background error covariance matrix of  $\lambda_{j|j+1:t-1}^{a}$  and  $\mathbf{c}_{t}^{f}$ . After (2)-(5), the updated  $\lambda_{j|j+1:t}^{a}$ , j(j=t-M+1,...,t-1) will be used to construct the prior scaling factor at next time t+1 (1).

As a Monte Carlo approach, the EnKS uses the forecast-analysis error covariances based 132 on ensemble forecasts / analyses to compute the Kalman gain matrix with time lags, to incorporate 133 observations from the past to the future. The first iteration of EnKS is equivalent to EnKF that 134 assimilates observations up to the analysis time. The following iterations of EnKS assimilate 135 observations in the future to update the state at the analysis time. The hourly forecasts of PM<sub>2.5</sub> 136 concentration from the cycling assimilation experiment matched the independent observed 137 quantities (Figure 1). Therefore, the ability of EnKS to retrieve the source emissions has been 138 139 demonstrated. Previous studies also showed that simulations forced by the posterior emissions could produce improved forecasts for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub> than those with a priori emissions 140 (Peng et al., 2020). 141

# 142 2.2 WRF-Chem model, observations and emissions

To simulate the transport of aerosol and chemical species, the WRF-Chem model version 3.6.1 (Grell et al., 2005) that has the meteorological and chemical components fully coupled is used. The model parameterization schemes follow Peng et al. (2017). Figure 2 shows the model domain that covers most east Asia regions. Horizontal grid spacing is 45 km with 57 vertical levels and model top at 10 hPa.

Experiments are conducted for each year from 2016 to 2020 separately. The 6-h 148 meteorological observations, including all in-situ observations and cloud motion vectors from the 149 National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) Global Data Assimilation System (GDAS; 150 http://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/mmb/data\_processing/prepbufr.doc/table\_2.htm), are assimilated 151 every 6 h. The hourly observed chemical quantities, which contain PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, 152 and CO from the Ministry of Ecology and Environment of China (https://aqicn.org/map/china/cn/), 153 are assimilated every hour. Figure 2 shows the assimilated chemical observation network, which 154 has 560 randomly chosen stations from 1576 stations in total. The thinning of observations is 155 applied to avoid correlated errors of observations. The spatial autocorrelation of the thinning of 156 observations is close to the original observations (Peng et al., 2017). The observation priors are 157 computed by the "observer" portion of the Grid-point Statistical Interpolation system (GSI) (Kleist 158 et al., 2009). 159

The hourly and time-invariantly prescribed anthropogenic emissions are obtained from the
 EDGAR-HTAP (Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research for Hemispheric Transport

of Air Pollution v2.2) v2.2 inventory (Janssens-Maenhout et al., 2015), in which the Chinese
emissions are derived from MEIC in 2010 (Lei et al., 2011; Li et al., 2014). Natural emissions,
including the biogenic (Guenther et al., 1995), dust (Ginoux et al., 2001), dimethyl sulfide and sea
salt emissions (Chin et al., 2000), are computed online.

#### 166 **2.3 Assimilation and ensemble configurations**

The PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission directly gives the primary PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and then the primary PM<sub>2.5</sub> along 167 with other precursor emissions could contribute to the secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The observations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> 168 concentrations that contain both primary and secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub>, are used to constrain the PM<sub>2.5</sub> 169 170 emission through data assimilation. Thus the correlations between the concentration observations and source emissions might be contaminated by the secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Since the secondary 171 formation process can be captured by the WRF-Chem model, the impact of the secondary  $PM_{2.5}$ 172 is indirectly considered. The detailed updated state variables with the according observations 173 follow Peng et al. (2018). The concentrations and emissions of PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> precursors 174 that have observations (SO<sub>2</sub> and NO), are updated by the observed quantities, respectively, but the 175 VOC that are also PM<sub>2.5</sub> precursors are not updated due to the lack of direct and limited 176 observations. One possible way to untangle the impact of secondary  $PM_{2.5}$  on the estimates of 177 PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission is to jointly estimate the source emission, primary and secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub> given the 178 concentration observations. 179

180 The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) operational EnKF system (https://dtcenter.ucar.edu/com-GSI/users/docs/users\_guide/GSIUserGuide\_v3.7.pdf), which is an 181 182 EnSRF and modified with the EnKS feature, is used to assimilate the observations. Ensemble size is set to 50. To combat the sampling error resulted from a limited ensemble size, covariance 183 localization and inflation are applied. The Gaspari and Cohn (GC) (1999) function with a length 184 scale of 675 km is used to localize the impact of observations and mitigate the spurious error 185 correlations between observations and state variables. The constant multiplicative posterior 186 inflation (Whitaker and Hamill 2012) with coefficients 1.12 for all meteorological and chemical 187 variables is applied to enlarge the ensemble spread. The inflation  $\beta$  for advancing the scale factor 188 189 is 1.2. The smoothing length M for source emissions is 4, and the EnKS lagged length K is 6. The larger the K value, the more future observations are assimilated to constrain the current emission 190 estimate. But the sample estimated temporal correlations could be contaminated by sampling errors 191

and model errors, especially with increased lagged times. Thus, there is a tradeoff between the amount of future observations and accuracy of sample estimated temporal correlations. The choice of K (=6) is determined by sensitivity experiments.

At 0000 UTC 26 December of previous year, ensemble initial conditions (ICs) of the 195 meteorological fields are generated by adding random perturbations that sample the static 196 background error covariances (Barker et al., 2012) on the NCEP FNL (Final) analyses (Torn et al., 197 2006). Ensemble ICs of the chemical fields are 0, and source emissions of each ensemble member 198 199 are adopted from the EDGAR-HTAP v2.2 inventory with random perturbations of mean 0 and 200 variances of 10% of the emission values. Hourly ensemble lateral boundary conditions (LBCs) are generated using the same fixed-covariance perturbation technique as the ensemble ICs. After 6-d 201 202 spin up, ensemble data assimilation experiments start cycling for each year.

#### 203 **3. PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission for years 2016-2020**

Starting from the time-invariant source emission PR2010 (Janssens-Maenhout et al., 2015), 204 the dynamics-based estimates of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are obtained, which include both the 205 206 contributions of the anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions. The mean annual  $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from biomass burning in China (2003~2017) was 0.51 Tg (Yin et al., 2019). The annual 207 dynamics-based estimates of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission (DEPE) averaged over mainland China for years 208 2016-2020 without biomass burning emissions are 7.66, 7.40, 7.02, 6.62 and 6.38 Tg, respectively. 209 210 The values from the Multi-resolution Emission Inventory (MEIC; Zheng et al., 2018) that does not consider the contributions of biomass burning emissions, are 8.10, 7.60, 6.70, 6.38 and 6.04 Tg, 211 212 respectively. Thus the annual DEPE are very closed to the values of MEIC. From year 2017 to 2020, the estimated annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are reduced 3.4%, 8.4%, 13.6% and 16.7% 213 respectively compared to that of year 2016. There has been 3%-5% persistent reduction of annual 214 PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from year 2017 to 2020, which demonstrates the effectiveness of China's Clean 215 Air Action (2013) implemented since 2013 and China Blue Sky Defense War Plan (2018) enforced 216 since 2018 with strengthened industrial emission standards, phased out outdated industrial 217 capacities, promoted clean fuels in residential sector and so on (Zhang et al., 2019). 218

The monthly DEPE show reduction of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission nearly in each month from years 200 2016 to 2020 (Figure 3a), which further demonstates the effectiveness of China's national plan. 201 Compared to year 2016, both the reduction amount and reduction ratio of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission are more

prominent for February, March, June-September, and November than the other months (Figure 3b). 222 Given larger magnitudes of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission in winter than in summer, emission controls with a 223 focus from October to May should be considered in the design of future clean air actions in China, 224 since total  $PM_{2.5}$  emission during this period accounts for approximate 75% annual amount. Spatial 225 distributions of the changes of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from year 2017 to 2020 compared to year 2016 226 show significant decreases occurred at Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei region (BTH), Yangtze River Delta 227 region (YRD), Pearl River Delta region (PRD) and Sichuan-Chongqing Region (SCR), especially 228 for years 2019-2020 (Figure 4). From year 2016 to 2020, BTH, YRD and SRC have larger 229 reductions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission than PRD, but SCR has larger reduction ratio compared to year 2016 230 than BTH and YRD (Figure 5). Therefore, BTH and YRD have more potentials for PM2.5 emission 231 controls than PRD and SCR, which can give a guidance for future clean air actions. More 232 233 specifically, most provinces have PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission reduction from year 2016 to 2020, and the reduction ratios generally increase from year 2017 to 2020 (Table 1), which confirms continuous 234 235 and effective emission controls from Clean Air Action to Blue Sky Defense War Plan in China. The monthly DEPE also demonstates the effectiveness of strict implementations of emission 236 237 reduction policies in China, such as the coal ban for residential heating since the 2017-2018 winter. There was a sharp change of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission, from increase in 2017 to decrease in 2018. As shown 238 239 by Figure 6, spatial distributions of the changes of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in December compared to November in 2017 show obvious increases in most China. However, the changes in 2018 show 240 241 significant decreases in areas of Beijing, Tianjin, Hebei, Shanxi, Henan and Anhui provinces due to the implementation of the coal ban. 242

Despites the trend in  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions from year 2016 to 2020, the DEPE of year 2016 has 243 similar monthly distributions to MEIC2016-2020 in general (Figure 3a). MEIC has a "Pan-shape" 244 monthly distribution with nearly time-invariant PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from April to October. This 245 seasonal dependence of emissions is mainly contributed by the variations of residential energy use, 246 which are empirically dependent on coarse monthly mean temperature intervals and thus cannot 247 reflect the realistic monthly variations (Streets et al., 2003; Li et al., 2017). The centralized heating 248 system in North China has a fixed date of turning-on and turning-off during each heating season. 249 Therefore, a sudden raise of emissions from October to November and a sudden drop of emissions 250 251 from March to April are shown. But the turning-on and turning-off date are variable in different regions, which imposes a smoothing impact on the emissions. However, the DEPE yet shows a 252

"V-shape" monthly distribution, with the minimum occurring in August. The estimated  $PM_{2.5}$ 253 emission is 11.8% higher than MEIC2016 in April but 12.1% lower than MEIC2016 in August, 254 and these different monthly distributions can influence the consequent climate responses including 255 the radiative forcing and energy budget (Yang et al., 2020) and also impact the health issues (Liu 256 et al., 2018). Moreover, monthly fractions of the DEPE are consistent cross years (Figure 3c). The 257 absence of interannual variations of monthly PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction provides basis for previous 258 studies that follow the same monthly changes of source emissions from different years (Zhang et 259 al., 2009; Zheng et al., 2020, 2021). Monthly allocations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission can be directly and 260 objectively obtained given an estimated total annual amount based on the estimated monthly 261 fractions of DEPE, which is valuable for emission inventory, air quality simulation, and potentially 262 applications for future scenarios due to more accurate month fractions of DEPE. Since the hourly 263 priors of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations from the cycling assimilation for optimally estimating PM<sub>2.5</sub> 264 emission fit to the observed PM<sub>2.5</sub> quantities (Figure 1), the monthly DEPE provides more realistic 265 266 monthly fluctuations than the empirical estimate.

# 267 **4. Diurnal variations of PM2.5 emission**

The DEPE with high temporal-resolution given the time-invariant prior PR2010 can reveal 268 features that are unable to represent in the commonly used emission estimates. Although the prior 269 PR2010 has no diurnal variations, hourly posteriors of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission provide the first objectively 270 estimated diurnal variations for different seasons for years 2016-2020. However, these estimated 271 diurnal variations include the contributions of the time-varying boundary layer. An observing 272 system simulation experiment (OSSE) is performed to investigate the effects of the boundary layer. 273 274 Details of this OSSE are presented in Appendix. The results indicate that the magnitude of posterior PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from the OSSE is closer to the true emission than the prior. Since we 275 276 have hourly assimilated observations to simultaneously update the chemical concentrations and source emissions, the impacts of time-varying boundary layer on the posterior PM2.5 emissions are 277 278 limited (Figures S1). A little larger estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions occurred in the morning and smaller estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions occurred in the afternoon, comparing to the time-279 invariant true emission. Nevertheless, the influences of time-varying boundary layer are still 280 important to PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates. To statistically present the diurnal variations, the fractions 281 282 of hourly PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions divided by the daily amount are averaged over different years and

regions after excluding the impacts of time-varying boundary layer (Figures 7 and 8, and Table 2). The diurnal variations of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission are critical for understanding the mechanisms of  $PM_{2.5}$ formation and evolution and are also essential for  $PM_{2.5}$  simulation and forecast.

Five-year mean diurnal variations of the estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction for mainland 286 287 China show that despite the monthly variations of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission, the diurnal-variation fractions for November, December, January and February are similar, while those for June, July and August 288 are similar (Figure 7a). There are stronger diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission in summer than in 289 winter, which are represented by larger PM2.5 emission fractions during morning and less PM2.5 290 291 emission fractions during evening. The diurnal variations of PM2.5 emission from March to May gradually transform from the patterns of winter to those of summer, and vice versa for the diurnal 292 variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from September to November. The monthly changes of diurnal 293 variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission are consistent with the seasonal dependence, since monthly variations 294 295 of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission are mainly related to the variations of residential consumptions (Li et al., 2017) in which the space-heating has nearly no diurnal variations and then larger  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions during 296 winter lead to reduced diurnal variations than summer. Similar to the monthly fractions of 297 estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission for mainland China, diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction are 298 consistent cross years for a given month (Figure 8). Table 2 gives five-year mean diurnal variations 299 of the estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction for each month. Based on these high-resolution diurnal-300 variation fractions, hourly estimates of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission can be objectively obtained for a given 301 monthly estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission. 302

Despite the high temporal resolution, the DEPE also has the ability to analyze diurnal 303 variations for specific cities. The monthly changes of diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission 304 estimated for megacities with urban populations larger than 5 million and non-megacities with 305 urban populations smaller than 5 million (Notice of the State Council on Adjusting the Standards 306 for Categorizing City Sizes, 2014) are consistent with those estimated from mainland China 307 (Figure 7). Compared to the diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimated for mainland China, 308 the megacities have stronger diurnal variations, while the non-megacities have weaker diurnal 309 variations. These detailed descriptions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission that are usually absent in common 310 311 emission estimates can be essential for PM2.5 simulation, especially for providing timely and 312 realistic guidance for severe haze events.

There has been lack of local measurements for diurnal variations and widely adopted 313 diurnal variation profiles of PM2.5 emission in China. Compared to the diurnal variations of PM2.5 314 emission fractions estimated based on diurnal variation profiles from US and EU (Wang et al., 315 2010; Du et al., 2020), the estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions are 1.25% larger during the evening, 316 which greatly changes the diurnal variations of DEPE. The noon and evening peaks estimated from 317 DEPE have smaller  $PM_{2.5}$  emission fractions, with mean underestimations of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission 318 fraction of 0.40% and 0.83% for noon peak and evening peak respectively (Figures 7a and 9). In 319 fact, the smaller evening peaks of Wang et al. (2010) occurred in November, December, January, 320 February and March, while they are almost indistinct from April to October, similar to that from 321 DEPE. The morning peak of Wang et al. (2010) is similar to that of DEPE for spring and fall, but 322 the former overestimates PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction of 0.57% for winter while underestimates PM<sub>2.5</sub> 323 324 emission fraction of 1.05% for summer. Due to the overestimated peaks, diurnal variations of Wang et al.(2010) have sharper appearance rate for morning peak and disappearance rate for 325 326 evening peak. Compared to the diurnal variations based on diurnal variation profiles from ES and EU (Wang et al., 2010), the diurnal variations of the DEPE are constrained by the atmospheric-327 328 chemical model and observed PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations, which can objectively determine the diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission for specific regions and seasons. 329

#### 330

## 5. Impact of COVID-19 on PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions

The abrupt outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic has produced dramatically socioeconomic 331 332 impacts in China. To prevent the virus spread, a lockdown was first implemented on 23 January 2020 in Wuhan, Hubei province, and subsequently the national lockdown has been enforced in 333 334 China (Liu et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2021). Consequently, the total PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission of February 2020 for China shows an obvious decrease compared to those of previous 335 336 years (Figure 3). The high temporal-resolution DEPE reveals the detailed changes of  $PM_{2.5}$ emission with time (Figure 10). The PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission started to decrease right around the COVID 337 outbreak, and had been smaller than those of year 2019 till early March. The emissions at the 338 following months of 2020 are similar to those of 2019, due to the epidemic prevention and control 339 policies enforced by the China government. During February 2020, the DEPE shows significant 340 reductions at the north China plain and northeast of China where prominent PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission 341 342 occurred, while spotted PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission differences with small magnitudes showed at the other regions (Figures 11a-b). Along with recovery from the COVID-19, the estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission
rebounded in March (Figures 3a, 10, 11c-d), which is contributed to the national work resumption.
Thus, the DEPE is able to timely reflect the dynamic response of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission to the COVID19.

To avoid fluctuations due to diurnal variations and monthly changes of PM2.5 emission, 7-347 day averaged PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission differences between year 2020 and 2019 are used to analyze the 348 dynamic impact of COVID-19 on PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission (Figure 12). Before the lockdown, there were 349 slight PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission differences over several provinces (Figures 12a-b). During the first week of 350 lockdown, PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission reduction larger than  $5 \times 10^{-2}$  (µg·m<sup>-2</sup>·s<sup>-1</sup>) that is about 60%-70% 351 emission reduction, occurred at Hubei, Hunan, Guangdong, Anhui and Zhejiang provinces (Figure 352 12c). The  $PM_{2.5}$  emission reduction extended to BTH and Shandong province during the second 353 354 week of lockdown (Figure 12d), and continuously spread to the three northeast provinces of China during the third week of lockdown (Figure 12e). During the third week of lockdown, the increased 355 356  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions for BTH and SCR are possibly caused by the long national vocation of spring holiday of year 2019 (Ji et al., 2018). The inhomogeneous spatial variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions 357 358 possibly relate with different traditions and policy enforcements for different provinces. The PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission reduction had been maintained over the central and northern China till early March when 359 360 the lockdown was lift (Figures 12f-i). Though it is hard to see continuous and consistent signal of lockdown for the whole China, the timely DEPE can provide up-to-date guidance for quantifying 361 362 socioeconomic impacts from rare events with large emission changes such as the COVID-19.

Although there were significant reductions of  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions over the central and northern China in February 2020, a severe air pollution event occurred over the north China in early February 2020. Previous studies have shown that the factors influencing the severe air pollution event include the still intensive emissions from industrial, power and residential, unfavorable meteorological condition, anomalously high humidity that promoted aerosol heterogeneous chemistry, and secondary aerosol formation associated with increased atmosphere oxidants (Le et al. 2020; Sulaymon et al. 2021; Li et al., 2021).

### 370 6. Discussion

High temporal-resolution and dynamics-based estimations of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission can be objectively and optimally obtained by assimilating past and future observed surface  $PM_{2.5}$ 

concentrations through flow-dependent error statistics. This advanced assimilation strategy can be 373 applied for emission estimates of other chemical species when corresponding observations are 374 available, and extend to observation types besides the surface concentrations, like the aerosol 375 optical depth (Liu et al., 2011; Choi et al., 2020). Moreover, current estimates of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission 376 are lack of explicitly representations of primary and secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub>, which could be resolved by 377 joint estimation of the source emission, primary and secondary  $PM_{2.5}$  given the concentration 378 observations. Another deficiency of this top-down technique is that it cannot directly determine 379 dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions for different sectors and contributions from different policies, 380 although the bottom-up technique has the potential to untangle the different contributions from 381 different policies and quantify the different impacts on different sectors. However, this top-down 382 technique can be integrated into the bottom-up technique to retain advantages of both methods. 383 384 One future work is to integrate the top-down technique with the bottom-up one, by which the emission estimates for different sectors and polices could be quantified. The annual emission 385 386 estimate from the bottom-up technique can be further downscaled to hourly estimates by first distributing the annual amount to each month through the monthly allocations estimated from the 387 388 top-down technique, and then assuming evenly daily distribution, finally applying the fractions of diurnal variation estimated from the top-down technique. The information collected by the bottom-389 390 up technique is retained, while the common drawback of coarse temporal resolution for the bottomup technique is remedied. The integrated bottom-up and top-down technique can improve 391 392 spatiotemporal representations of source emissions cross time scales and sectors, which is beneficial for emission inventory, air quality forecast, regulation policy and emission trading 393 scheme. 394

395

# 396 Acknowledgments

This work is jointly sponsored by the National Key R&D Program of China through Grant 2017YFC1501603 and the National Natural Science Foundation of China through Grants 41922036 and 42275153. We are grateful to the High Performance Computing Center of Nanjing University for doing the cycling ensemble assimilation experiments.

401 Data availability

The meteorological data used for meteorological initial conditions and boundary conditions 402 is available from the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR) Research Data 403 Archive (https://rda.ucar.edu/datasets/ds083.3/). The assimilated meteorological observations are 404 available from the UCAR Research Data Archive (https://rda.ucar.edu/datasets/ds337.0/), and the 405 assimilated chemical observations are available from https://aqicn.org/map/china/cn/. The 406 prescribed time-invariant anthropogenic emissions are available from the Emission Database for 407 Global Atmospheric Research for Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution (EDGAR-HTAP) 408 inventory (https://data.jrc.ec.europa.eu/dataset/jrc-edgar-htap v2-2) and the Multi-resolution 409 Emission Inventory (MEIC; http://meicmodel.org/?page\_id=560). 410

The WRF-Chem model version 3.6.1 is available from
https://www2.mmm.ucar.edu/wrf/users/download/get\_sources.html#WRF-Chem. The NOAA
operational EnKF system is available from https://dtcenter.org/community-code/gridpointstatistical-interpolation-gsi.

415

#### 416 **Competing interests**

The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

418

417

#### 419 **References**

420 Attri, A. K., Kumar, U., and Jain, V. K.: Microclimate: formation of ozone by fireworks, Nature, 411, 1015, 421 2001.

Barker, D., Huang, X.-Y., Liu, Z., Auligné, T., Zhang, X., Rugg, S., Ajjaji, R., Bourgeois, A., Bray, J., Chen,
Y., Demirtas, M., Guo, Y.-R., Henderson, T., Huang, W., Lin, H.-C., Michalakes, J., Rizvi, S., and
Zhang, X.: The Weather Research and Forecasting Model's Community Variational/Ensemble Data
Assimilation System: WRFDA, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 93, 831–843, <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-</u>
<u>D-11-00167.1</u>, 2012.

Cao, H., Fu, T.-M., Zhang, L., Henze, D. K., Miller, C. C., Lerot, C., Abad, G. G., De Smedt, I., Zhang, Q., van Roozendael, M., Hendrick, F., Chance, K., Li, J., Zheng, J., and Zhao, Y.: Adjoint inversion of Chinese non-methane volatile organic compound emissions using space-based observations of formaldehyde and glyoxal, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 15017–15046, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-15017-2018, 2018.
Chen, C., Dubovik, O., Henze, D. K., Chin, M., Lapyonok, T., Schuster, G. L., Ducos, F., Fuertes, D., Litvinov, P., Li, L., Lopatin, A., Hu, Q., and Torres, B.: Constraining global aerosol emissions using

- 433 POLDER/PARASOL satellite remote sensing observations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 19, 14585–14606,
  434 https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-14585-2019, 2019.
- Chin, M., Rood, R. B., Lin, S. J., Muller, J. F., and Thompson, A. M.: Atmospheric sulfur cycle simulated in the
  global model GO-CART: Model description and global properties, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 105,
  24671–24687, 2000.
- Choi, Y., Chen, S. H., Huang, C. C., Earl, K., Chen, C. Y., Schwartz, C. S., and Matsui, T.: Evaluating the impact
  of assimilating aerosol optical depth observations on dust forecasts over North Africa and the East
  Atlantic using different data assimilation methods, Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems,
  12(4), e2019MS001890. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2019ms001890</u>, 2020.
- Du, Q., Zhao, C., Zhang, M., Dong, X., Chen, Y., Liu, Z., Hu, Z., Zhang, Q., Li, Y., Yuan, R., and Miao, S.:
  Modeling diurnal variation of surface PM2.5 concentrations over East China with WRF-Chem: impacts
  from boundary-layer mixing and anthropogenic emission, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 2839–2863,
  https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-2839-2020, 2020.
- Elbern, H., Strunk, A., Schmidt, H., and Talagrand, O.: Emission rate and chemical state estimation by 4-dimensional variational inversion, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 3749 3769, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-3749-2007,
  2007.Gaspari, G. and Cohn S. E.: Construction of correlation functions in two and three dimensions, Q.
  J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 125, 723–757, 1999.
- Ginoux, P., Chin, M., Tegen, I., Prospero, J. M., Holben, B., Dubovik, O., and Lin, S.-J.: Sources and
  distributions of dust aerosols simulated with the GOCART model, J. Geophys. Res., 106, 20255–20273,
  doi:10.1029/2000JD000053, 2001.
- Grell, G., Peckham, S. E., Schmitz, R., McKeen, S. A., Frost, G., Skamarock, W. C., and Eder, B.: Fully coupled
  "online" chem- istry within the WRF model, Atmos. Environ., 39, 6957–6975,
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.04.027, 2005.
- Guenther, A., Hewitt, C. N., Erickson, D., Fall, R., Geron, C., Graedel, T., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Lerdau, M.,
  McKay, W., Pierce, T., Scholes, B., Steinbrecher, R., Tallamraju, R., Taylor, J., and Zimmerman, P.: A
  global model of natural volatile organic compound emissions, J. Geophys. Res., 100, 8873–8892,
  doi:10.1029/94JD02950, 1995.
- 460 Huang, X., Ding, A., Gao, J., Zheng, B., Zhou, D., Qi, X., Tang, R., Wang, J., Ren, C., Nie, W., Chi, X., Xu, Z., Chen, L., Li, Y., Che, F., Pang, N., Wang, H., Tong, D., Qin, W., Cheng, W., Liu, W., Fu, Q., Liu, B., 461 Chai, F., Davis, S. J., Zhang, Q., and He, K.: Enhanced secondary pollution offset reduction of primary 462 463 emissions during COVID-19 lockdown in China, Natl. Sci. Rev., nwaa137, 464 https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwaa137, 2020.
- Huang, J., Pan, X. C., Guo, X. B., and Li, G. X.: Health impact of China's Air Pollution Prevention and Control
  Action Plan: an analysis of national air quality monitoring and mortality data, Lancet Planet. Health, 2,
  E313–E323, https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(18)30141-4, 2018.

- Janssens-Maenhout, G., Crippa, M., Guizzardi, D., Dentener, F., Muntean, M., Pouliot, G., Keating, T., Zhang,
  Q., Kurokawa, J., Wankmüller, R., Denier van der Gon, H., Kuenen, J. J. P., Klimont, Z., Frost, G.,
  Darras, S., Koffi, B., and Li, M.: HTAP\_v2.2: a mosaic of regional and global emission grid maps for
  2008 and 2010 to study hemispheric transport of air pollution, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 11411–11432,
  https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-11411-2015, 2015.
- Ji, D., Cui, Y., Li, L., He, J., Wang, L., Zhang, H., Wang, W., Zhou, L., Maenhaut, W., Wen, T., and Wang, Y.:
  Characterization and source identification of fine particulate matter in urban Beijing during the 2015
  Spring Festival, Sci. Total Environ., 628–629, 430–
  440, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.304, 2018.
- Jiang, Z., Worden, J. R., Worden, H., Deeter, M., Jones, D. B. A., Arellano, A. F., and Henze, D. K.: A 15-year
  record of CO emissions constrained by MOPITT CO observations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 17, 4565–4583,
  https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-4565-2017, 2017.
- Kalnay, E.: *Atmospheric* modeling, data assimilation and predictability (p. 341), Cambridge: Cambridge
  University Press, 2002.
- Kleist, D. T., Parrish, D. F., Derber, J. C., Treadon, R., Errico, R. M., and Yang, R.: Improving incremental
  balance in the GSI 3DVAR analysis system, Mon. Weather Rev., 137, 1046–1060,
  doi:10.1175/2008MWR2623.1, 2009.
- Le, T., Wang, Y., Liu, L., Yang, J., Yung, Y. L., Li, G., and Seinfeld, J. H.: Unexpected air pollution with marked
   emission reductions during the COVID-19 outbreak in China, Science, 702–706,
   https://https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb7431, 2020.
- Lei, Y., Zhang, Q., He, K. B., and Streets, D. G.: Primary anthropogenic aerosol emission trends for China,
  1990–2005, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 931–954, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-931-2011, 2011.
- Li, N., Tang, K., Wang, Y., Wang, J., Feng, W., Zhang, H., Liao, H., Hu, J., Long, X., and Shi, C.: Is the efficacy
  of satellite-based inversion of SO2 emission model dependent? Environmental Research Letters, 16,
  035018, 2021.
- Li, K., Jacob, D. J., Liao, H., Zhu, J., Shah, V., Shen, L., Bates, K. H., Zhang, Q., and Zhai, S.: A Two-Pollutant
  Strategy for Improving Ozone and Particulate Air Quality in China, Nat. Geosci., 12, 906–
  910, <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0464-x</u>, 2019a.
- Li, J. and Wang, Y.: Inferring the anthropogenic NO<sub>x</sub> emission trend over the United States during 2003–2017
  from satellite observations: was there a flattening of the emission trend after the Great Recession? Atmos.
  Chem. Phys., 19, 15339–15352, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-15339-2019, 2019b.
- Li, M., Zhang, Q., Kurokawa, J.-I., Woo, J.-H., He, K., Lu, Z., Ohara, T., Song, Y., Streets, D. G., Carmichael,
  G. R., Cheng, Y., Hong, C., Huo, H., Jiang, X., Kang, S., Liu, F., Su, H., and Zheng, B.: MIX: a mosaic
  Asian anthropogenic emission inventory under the international collaboration framework of the MICSAsia and HTAP, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 17, 935–963, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-935-2017</u>, 2017.

- Li, M., Zhang, Q., Streets, D. G., He, K. B., Cheng, Y. F., Emmons, L. K., Huo, H., Kang, S. C., Lu, Z., Shao,
  M., Su, H., Yu, X., and Zhang, Y.: Mapping Asian anthropogenic emissions of non-methane volatile
  organic compounds to multiple chemical mechanisms, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 5617–
  5638, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-5617-2014, 2014.
- Liu, J., Yin, H., Tang, X., Zhu, T., Zhang, Q., Liu, Z., Tang, X., and Yi, H.: Transition in air pollution, disease
  burden and health cost in China: A comparative study of long-term and short-term exposure,
  Environmental Pollution, 277, 116770, 2021.
- Liu, T., Wang, X. Y., Hu, J. L., Wang, Q., An, J. Y., Gong, K. J., Sun, J. J., Li, L., Qin, M. M., Li, J. Y.,
  Tian, J. J., Huang, Y. W., Liao, H., Zhou, M., Hu, Q. Y., Yan, R. S., Wang, H. L., and Huang, C.:
  Driving Forces of Changes in Air Quality during the COVID-19 Lockdown Period in the Yangtze River
  Delta Region, China, Environ. Sci. Technol., 7, 779–786, <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00511</u>,
  2020.
- 515 Liu, T., Cai, Y., Feng, B., Cao, G., Lin, H., Xiao, J., Li, X., Liu, S., Pei, L., Fu, L., Yang, X., and Zhang, B.: 516 Long-term mortality benefits of air quality improvement during the twelfth five-year-plan period in 31 517 provincial capital cities of China, Atmospheric Environment, 173. 53-61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.10.054, 2018. 518
- Liu, Z., Liu, Q., Lin, H. C., Schwartz, C. S., Lee, Y. H., andWang, T.: Three-dimensional variational
  assimilation of MODIS aerosol optical depth: implementation and application to a dust storm over
  East Asia, J. Geophys. Res., 116, D23206,https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016159, 2011.
- Miyazaki, K., Bowman, K., Sekiya, T., Eskes, H., Boersma, F., Worden, H., Livesey, N., Payne, V. H., Sudo,
  K., Kanaya, Y., Takigawa, M., and Ogochi, K.: Updated tropospheric chemistry reanalysis and emission
  estimates, TCR-2, for 2005–2018, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 12, 2223–2259, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-</u>
  12-2223-2020, 2020.
- Miyazaki, K., Eskes, H., Sudo, K., Boersma, K. F., Bowman, K., and Kanaya, Y.: Decadal changes in global
   surface NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from multi-constituent satellite data assimilation, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 17, 807–
   837, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-807-2017, 2017.
- Müller, J.-F., Stavrakou, T., Bauwens, M., George, M., Hurtmans, D., Coheur, P.-F., Clerbaux, C., and Sweeney,
   C.: Top-Down CO Emissions Based on IASI Observations and Hemispheric Constraints on OH Levels,
   Geophys. Res. Lett., 45, 1621–1629, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076697, 2018.
- Notice of the State Council on Adjusting the Standards for Categorizing City Sizes (in Chinese) (Chinese State
   Council, 2014); <u>http://www.gov.cn/zwgk/2013-09/12/content\_2486773.htm</u>
- Peng, Z., Lei, L., Liu, Z., Liu, H., Chu, K., and Kou, X.: Impact of Assimilating Meteorological Observations
  on Source Emissions Estimate and Chemical Simulations, Geophys. Res. Lett., 47,
  e2020GL089030, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL089030</u>, 2020.

- Peng, Z., Lei, L., Liu, Z., Sun, J., Ding, A., Ban, J., Chen, D., Kou, X., and Chu, K.: The impact of multi-species
  surface chemical observation assimilation on air quality forecasts in China, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18,
  17387–17404, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-17387-2018, 2018.
- Peng, Z., Liu, Z., Chen, D., and Ban, J.: Improving PM<sub>2.5</sub> forecast over China by the joint adjustment of initial
  conditions and source emissions with an ensemble Kalman filter, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 17, 4837–
  4855, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-4837-2017, 2017.
- Peng, Z., Zhang, M., Kou, X., Tian, X., and Ma, X.: A regional carbon data assimilation system and its
  preliminary evaluation in East Asia, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 1087–1104, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-1087-2015</u>, 2015.
- Peters, W., Jacobson, A. R., Sweeney, C., Andrews, A. E., Conway, T. J., Masarie, K., Miller, J. B., Bruhwiler,
  L. M. P., Petron, G., Hirsch, A. I., Worthy, D. E. J., van derWerf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Wennberg, P.
  O., Krol, M. C., and Tans, P. P.: An atmospheric perspective on North American carbon dioxide
- 549 exchange: CarbonTracker, P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 104, 18925–18930, 2007.
- Qu, Z., Henze, D. K., Capps, S. L., Wang, Y., Xu, X., and Wang, J.: Monthly top-down NOx emissions for
  China (2005–2012): a hybrid inversion method and trend analysis, J. Geophys. Res., 122, 4600–4625,
  https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025852, 2017.
- Streets, D. G., Bond, T. M. L., Carmichael, G. R., Fernandes, S., Fu, Q., He, D., Klimont, Z., Nelson, S. M.,
  Tsai, N. Y., Wang, M. Q., Woo, J.-H., and Yarber, K. F.: An inventory of gaseous and primary aerosol
  emissions in Asia in the year 2000. J. Geophys. Res., 108(D21), 8809, doi:10.1029/2002JD003093,
  2003.
- Sulaymon et al. 2021. Persistent high PM2.5 pollution driven by unfavorable meteorological conditions during
   the COVID-19 lockdown period in the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei region, China. Environmental
   Research. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111186
- Torn, R. D., Hakim, G. J., and Snyder, C.: Boundary conditions for limited-area ensemble Kalman filters, Mon.
  Weather Rev., 134,2490–2502, 2006.
- Wang, H., He, X., Liang, X., Choma, E. F., Liu, Y., Shan, L., Zheng, H., Zhang, S., Nielsen, C. P., Wang, S.,
  Wu, Y., and Evans, J. S.: Health benefits of on-road transportation pollution control programs in China,
  P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 117, 25370, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1921271117, 2020.
- Wang, G., Cheng, S. Y., Wei, W., Yang, X. W., Wang, X. Q. Jia, J., Lang, J. L., and Lv, Z.: Characteristics and
  emission reduction measures evaluation of PM2.5 during the two major events: APEC and Parade, Sci.
  Total Environ., 595, 81–92, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.03.231, 2017.
- Wang, Z., Li, J., Wang, Z., Yang, W., Tang, X., Ge, B., Yan, P., Zhu, L., Chen, X., and Chen, H.: Modeling study
  of regional severe hazes over mid-eastern China in January 2013 and its implications on pollution
  prevention and control, Sci. China-Earth Sci., 57, 3–13, 2014.

- Wang, X. Y., Liang, X. Z., Jiang, W. M., Tao, Z. N., Wang, J. X. L., Liu, H. N., Han, Z. W., Liu, S. Y., Zhang, Y. Y.,
  Grell, G. A., and Peckham, S. E.: WRF-Chem simulation of East Asian air quality: Sensitivity to temporal
  and vertical emissions distributions, Atmos. Environ., 44, 660–669, 2010.
- Whitaker, J. S. and Hamill, T. M.: Ensemble data assimilation without perturbed observations, Mon. Weather Rev.,
  130, 1913–1924,2002.
- Whitaker, J. S. and Hamill, T. M.: Evaluating methods to account for system errors in ensemble data assimilation,
   Mon. Weather Rev., 140, 3078–3089, 2012.
- Yang, Y., Ren, L., Li, H., Wang, H., Wang, P., Chen, L., Yue, X., and Liao, H.: Fast climate responses to aerosol
  emission reductions during the COVID-19 pandemic, Geophys. Res. Lett., 47,
  e2020GL089788, https://doi.org/10.1029/2020gl089788, 2020.
- Zhai, S., Jacob, D. J., Wang, X., Liu, Z., Wen, T., Shah, V., Li, K., Moch, J. M., Bates, K. H., Song, S., Shen,
  L., Zhang, Y., Luo, G., Yu, F., Sun, Y., Wang, L., Qi, M., Tao, J., Gui, K., Xu, H., Zhang, Q., Zhao, T.,
  Wang, Y., Lee, H. C., Choi, H., and Liao, H.: Control of particulate nitrate air pollution in China, Nat.
  Geosci., 14, 1–7, 2021.
- Zhang, Q., Zheng, Y., Tong, D., Shao, M., Wang, S., Zhang, Y., Xu, X., Wang, J., He, H., Liu, W., Ding, Y.,
  Lei, Y., Li, J., Wang, Z., Zhang, X., Wang, Y., Cheng, J., Liu, Y., Shi, Q., Yan, L., Geng, G., Hong, C.,
  Li, M., Liu, F., Zheng, B., Cao, J., Ding, A., Gao, J., Fu, Q., Huo, J., Liu, B., Liu, Z., Yang, F., He, K.,
  and Hao, J.: Drivers of Improved PM<sub>2.5</sub> Air Quality in China from 2013 to 2017, P. Natl. Acad. Sci.
  USA, 116, 24463–24469, <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1907956116</u>, 2019.
- Zhang, L., Shao, J. Y., Lu, X., Zhao, Y. H., Hu, Y. Y., Henze, D. K., Liao, H., Gong, S., and Zhang, Q.: Sources
  and processes affect-ing fine particulate matter pollution over North China: An adjoint analysis of the
  Beijing APEC period, Environ. Sci. Technol., 50,8731–8740, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b03010,
  2016.
- Zhang, Q., Streets, D. G., Carmichael, G. R., He, K. B., Huo, H., Kannari, A., Klimont, Z., Park, I. S., Reddy,
  S., Fu, J. S., Chen, D., Duan, L., Lei, Y., Wang, L. T., and Yao, Z. L.: Asian emis- sions in 2006 for the
  NASA INTEX-B mission, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 5131–5153, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-51312009, 2009.
- Zheng, B., Zhang, Q., Geng, G., Chen, C., Shi, Q., Cui, M., Lei, Y., and He, K.: Changes in China's
  anthropogenic emissions and air quality during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, Earth Syst. Sci. Data,
  13, 2895–2907, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-2895-2021, 2021.
- Zheng, B., Geng, G., Ciais, P., Davis, S. J., Martin, R. V., Meng, J., Wu, N., Chevallier, F., Broquet, G., Boersma,
  F., van der A, R., Lin, J., Guan, D., Lei, Y., He, K., and Zhang, Q.: Satellite-based estimates of decline
  and rebound in China's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions during COVID-19 pandemic, Sci. Adv., 6,
  eabd4998, <u>https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abd4998</u>, 2020.
- Zheng, B., Tong, D., Li, M., Liu, F., Hong, C., Geng, G., Li, H., Li, X., Peng, L., Qi, J., Yan, L., Zhang, Y.,
  Zhao, H., Zheng, Y., He, K., and Zhang, Q.: Trends in China's anthropogenic emissions since 2010 as

 607
 the consequence of clean air actions, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 14095–14111,

 608
 https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-14095-2018, 2018.

- Zhu, J., Chen, L., Liao, H., Yang, H., Yang, Y., and Yue, X.: Enhanced PM<sub>2.5</sub> Decreases and O<sub>3</sub> Increases in
   China during COVID-19 Lockdown by Aerosol-Radiation Feedback, Geophys. Res. Lett., 48,
   e2020GL090260, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL090260</u>, 2021.
- 612
- 613

# 614 Figures and Tables

# 615 Captions:

**Figure 1.** Times series of hourly PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration biases ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-3}$ ). The ensemble mean priors

617 compared to the observed quantities for December of years 2016-2020 (gray and black), and the

618 mean biases of years 2016-2020 (blue).

Figure 2. Model domain and observation sites for cycling assimilation. Red and blue dots denote
the assimilated and unassimilated observational sites, respectively.

- **Figure 3.** (a) Dynamics-based monthly  $PM_{2.5}$  emission estimates  $(Tg \cdot day^{-1})$  summed over mainland China of each year from 2016 to 2020 (colored) and the estimated  $PM_{2.5}$  emission from MEIC (gray); (b) Ratio of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission changes between two adjacent years from year 2016 to 2020 normalized by the  $PM_{2.5}$  emission of year 2016; (c) Monthly fractions of dynamics-based PM\_{2.5} emission estimates for years 2016-2020 (light blue), the five-year mean fractions of dynamics-based monthly  $PM_{2.5}$  emission estimates with bars denoting one standard deviation of the five-year variations (dark blue), and the monthly fractions of estimated  $PM_{2.5}$  emission from
- 628 MEIC (gray).
- **Figure 4.** (a) Spatial distribution of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ ) for
- year 2016, and compared to that of year 2016, spatial distributions of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub>
- emission changes of year (b) 2017, (c) 2018, (d) 2019 and (e) 2020.
- **Figure 5.** (a) The differences of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates between years 2017-
- 633 2020 and 2016, and (b) the differences normalized by that of year 2016.
- 634 **Figure 6**. Spatial distributions of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission changes in December compared to November
- in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018. Figure 7. Five-year mean diurnal variations of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub>
- emission fraction averaged over (a) mainland China, (b) megacities with urban population  $\geq 5$
- 637 million, and (c) non-megacities with urban population < 5 million.

- **Figure 8.** Diurnal variations of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions for years 2016-2020
- 639 (light blue) and five-year mean fractions with bars denoting one standard deviation of the five-
- 640 year variations (dark blue) are averaged over mainland China for (a) January, (b) April, (c) July,
- and (d) October.
- Figure 9. Diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction for each month based on diurnal variation
  profiles from ES and EU (Wang et al. 2010).
- Figure 10. Hourly (light red and blue) and daily (dark red and blue) dynamics-based  $PM_{2.5}$ emission estimates (kg·h<sup>-1</sup>) summed over mainland China from January to March of years 2019 and 2020.
- 647 **Figure 11.** Spatial distributions of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ ) on (b)
- 648 February and (d) March of year 2019, and spatial distributions of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission
- reduction of year 2020 compared to year 2019 for (c) February and (e) March.
- **Figure 12.** Mean spatial distributions of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission differences ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ ) between year
- 651 2020 and 2019 for 9 weeks starting at 9 January 2020. Negative (positive) values indicate that
- 652 PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission of year 2020 is smaller (larger) than that of year 2019. The numbers in (a) denote
- provinces as: 1 Heilongjiang, 2 Neimenggu, 3 Xinjiang, 4 Jilin, 5 Liaoning, 6 Gansu, 7 Hebei, 8
- Beijing, 9 Shanxi, 10 Tianjin, 11 Shanxi, 12 Ningxia, 13 Qinghai, 14 Shandong, 15 Xizang, 16
- Henan, 17 Jiangsu, 18 Anhui, 19 Sichuan, 20 Hubei, 21 Chongqing, 22 Shanghai, 23 Zhejiang, 24
- Hunan, 25 Jiangxi, 26 Yunnan, 27 Guizhou, 28 Fujian, 29 Guangxi, 30 Guangdong, 31 Taiwan,
- 657 32 Hongkong, 33 Macao, 34 Hainan.
- **Table 1.** Dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates of year 2016 for each province whose value
- is larger than 0.01  $\mu$ g·m<sup>-2</sup>·s<sup>-1</sup> are shown in the second column. Ratios of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission changes
- of years 2017-2020 compared to year 2016 are shown from the third to the sixth column, with
- negative (positive) values indicating decrease (increase) of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission.
- Table 2. Five-year mean diurnal fractions (%) of the dynamics-based  $PM_{2.5}$  emission estimates over mainland China on local solar time (LST) for each month.
- 664





668

**Figure 1.** Times series of hourly  $PM_{2.5}$  concentration biases ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-3}$ ). The ensemble mean priors compared to the observed quantities for December of years 2016-2020 (gray and black), and the mean biases of years 2016-2020 (blue). 



675
676 Figure 2. Model domain and observation sites for cycling assimilation. Red and blue dots denote the
677 assimilated and unassimilated observational sites, respectively.



Figure 3. (a) Dynamics-based monthly PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates (Tg·day<sup>-1</sup>) summed over mainland China of
 each year from 2016 to 2020 (colored) and the estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from MEIC (gray); (b) Ratio of PM<sub>2.5</sub>
 emission changes between two adjacent years from year 2016 to 2020 normalized by the PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission of
 year 2016; (c) Monthly fractions of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates for years 2016-2020 (light blue),
 the five-year mean fractions of dynamics-based monthly PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates with bars denoting one
 standard deviation of the five-year variations (dark blue), and the monthly fractions of estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub>



**Figure 4.** (a) Spatial distribution of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ ) for year 2016, and 697 compared to that of year 2016, spatial distributions of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission changes of year (b) 698 2017, (c) 2018, (d) 2019 and (e) 2020.







**Figure 7.** Five-year mean diurnal variations of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction averaged over (a) mainland







**Figure 8.** Diurnal variations of dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions for years 2016-2020

(light blue) and five-year mean fractions with bars denoting one standard deviation of the five-

year variations (dark blue) are averaged over mainland China for (a) January, (b) April, (c) July,and (d) October.





726 Figure 9. Diurnal variations of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission fraction for each month based on diurnal

variation profiles from ES and EU (Wang et al. 2010). 



Figure 10. Hourly (light red and blue) and daily (dark red and blue) dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates (kg·h<sup>-</sup>

734 <sup>1</sup>) summed over mainland China from January to March of years 2019 and 2020.





**Figure 11.** Spatial distributions of dynamics-based  $PM_{2.5}$  emission estimates ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ ) on (b) February and (d) March of year 2019, and spatial distributions of dynamics-based  $PM_{2.5}$  emission reduction of year 2020 compared to year 2019 for (c) February and (e) March.



**Figure 12.** Mean spatial distributions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission differences ( $\mu g \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$ ) between year 744 2020 and 2019 for 9 weeks starting at 9 January 2020. Negative (positive) values indicate that 745  $PM_{2.5}$  emission of year 2020 is smaller (larger) than that of year 2019. The numbers in (a) denote 746 provinces as: 1 Heilongjiang, 2 Neimenggu, 3 Xinjiang, 4 Jilin, 5 Liaoning, 6 Gansu, 7 Hebei, 8 747 Beijing, 9 Shanxi, 10 Tianjin, 11 Shanxi, 12 Ningxia, 13 Qinghai, 14 Shandong, 15 Xizang, 16 748 Henan, 17 Jiangsu, 18 Anhui, 19 Sichuan, 20 Hubei, 21 Chongqing, 22 Shanghai, 23 Zhejiang, 749 24 Hunan, 25 Jiangxi, 26 Yunnan, 27 Guizhou, 28 Fujian, 29 Guangxi, 30 Guangdong, 31 750 Taiwan, 32 Hongkong, 33 Macao, 34 Hainan. 751 752

**Table 1.** Dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates of year 2016 for each province whose value is larger than  $0.01 \ \mu g \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$  are shown in the second column. Ratios of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission changes of years 2017-2020 compared to year 2016 are shown from the third to the sixth column, with negative (positive) values indicating decrease (increase) of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission.

Province	$PM_{2.5}$ emission of year 2016 ( $\mu$ g·m <sup>-2</sup> ·s <sup>-1</sup> )	Percentage of $PM_{2.5}$ emission change for year 2017 ( $\frac{9}{2}$ )	Percentage of PM <sub>2.5</sub> emission change for year 2018	Percentage of PM <sub>2.5</sub> emission change for year 2019	Percentage of $PM_{2.5}$ emission change for year 2020 (%)
 Tioniin	0.2083	14.07	22.00	28 70	26.08
Shanahai	0.2083	-14.07	-22.99	-38.70	-20.98
Shandong	0.2007	-24.39	-30.21	-21.40	-30.03
Doiiing	0.1031	-13.20	-21.02	-13.37	-19.41
Deljing	0.1398	-20.04	-23.73	-41.92	-43.27
Liongeu	0.1178	-/.4/	-11.90	-20.39	-22.07
Jiangsu	0.1088	-0.32	-3.98	-12.09	-28.20
Shorwi	0.1004	-1.41	-3.08	-12.13	-24.91
	0.0883	$\frac{0.17}{6.22}$	7.90	-15.16	-15.85
Liaoning	0.0742	$\frac{0.32}{1.02}$	-2.58	$\frac{5.22}{6.22}$	$\frac{11.42}{21.57}$
Annui	0.068/	<u>1.92</u> 5.97	-5.63	-0.23	-21.57
Hubel	0.0574	-5.87	-1/.69	-19.76	-30.48
Zhejiang	0.0557	-3.62	-9.32	-9.99	-18.05
Chongqing	0.0525	-22.24	-29.81	-24.63	-38.41
Shanxi	0.0498	0.62	-1.9/	-18.05	-1/.85
Guangdong	0.0481	<u>1.21</u>	-6.01	-6.69	-14.37
Ningxia	0.0481	-8.17	-5.93	-24.46	-12.95
Hunan	0.0417	-6.40	-19.35	-9.91	-20.62
Guangxi	0.0390	-2.42	-3.52	-12.47	-22.31
Guizhou	0.0365	-4.01	-15.82	-21.74	-46.41
Jilin	0.0360	<u>12.30</u>	-3.22	<u>7.37</u>	<u>4.76</u>
Jiangxi	0.0353	<u>13.22</u>	-9.67	-7.19	-11.91
Sichuan	0.0337	-7.66	-15.66	-27.68	-37.93
Fujian	0.0244	<u>3.13</u>	-2.73	-8.13	-13.41
Heilongjiang	0.0231	<u>7.30</u>	-0.21	<u>3.14</u>	<u>3.91</u>
Yunnan	0.0221	-1.26	-7.16	-9.93	-15.35
Gansu	0.0177	-4.26	<u>5.28</u>	-17.89	-16.49
Hainan	0.0173	<u>3.93</u>	-0.41	-5.04	-4.78
Neimenggu	0.0141	-0.00	-3.63	-8.16	3.55

mannand China on local solar time (EST) for each month.													
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
	0	3.65	3.58	3.61	3.61	3.55	3.40	3.36	3.44	3.55	3.50	3.53	3.63
	1	3.77	3.69	3.72	3.76	3.74	3.65	3.58	3.56	3.70	3.64	3.64	3.75
	2	3.88	3.82	3.96	4.03	4.05	3.94	3.86	4.01	4.05	3.93	3.83	3.89
	3	3.98	3.94	4.05	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.19	4.14	4.19	4.05	3.93	3.99
	4	4.10	4.06	4.33	4.69	4.92	5.03	4.89	4.71	4.69	4.33	4.12	4.12
	5	4.32	4.38	4.76	5.20	5.46	5.48	5.45	5.39	5.27	4.80	4.45	4.32
	6	4.61	4.74	5.09	5.48	5.72	5.78	5.74	5.78	5.74	5.21	4.83	4.61
	7	4.78	4.90	5.17	5.55	5.78	5.92	5.95	5.98	5.92	5.37	4.98	4.79
	8	4.77	4.93	5.21	5.63	5.88	6.07	6.11	6.13	5.99	5.41	4.94	4.75
	9	4.54	4.79	5.14	5.52	5.79	6.00	6.03	6.02	5.60	4.89	4.42	4.37
	10	4.41	4.41	4.68	5.02	5.43	5.83	5.79	5.42	4.68	4.55	4.50	4.42
	11	4.38	4.40	4.42	4.39	4.45	4.79	4.78	4.66	4.56	4.47	4.36	4.30
	12	4.37	4.32	4.37	4.38	4.48	4.49	4.61	4.51	4.19	4.46	4.60	4.48
	13	4.34	4.43	4.34	4.09	3.93	4.06	4.07	4.09	4.23	4.38	4.33	4.29
	14	4.17	4.26	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.02	4.13	4.10	3.79	3.98	4.10	4.15
	15	4.10	3.99	3.82	3.55	3.46	3.63	3.59	3.45	3.39	3.79	4.07	4.12
	16	4.17	4.05	3.73	3.38	3.17	3.08	3.18	3.24	3.40	3.92	4.30	4.29
	17	4.24	4.17	3.79	3.36	3.08	2.95	3.01	3.12	3.41	3.98	4.31	4.30
	18	4.18	4.21	3.87	3.48	3.16	2.92	3.03	3.17	3.44	3.91	4.21	4.24
	19	4.06	4.04	3.72	3.35	3.12	2.92	2.93	3.08	3.34	3.73	3.99	4.07
	20	3.96	3.93	3.62	3.34	3.07	2.84	2.93	3.04	3.29	3.59	3.85	3.98
	21	3.81	3.75	3.47	3.21	2.99	2.83	2.80	2.93	3.16	3.44	3.65	3.79
	22	3.76	3.66	3.44	3.25	3.09	2.91	2.92	2.97	3.19	3.38	3.56	3.73
	23	3.65	3.55	3.39	3.34	3.23	3.16	3.09	3.04	3.23	3.32	3.47	3.62

Table 2. Five-year mean diurnal fractions (%) of the dynamics-based PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates
 over mainland China on local solar time (LST) for each month.

#### 767 Appendix: Effects of meteorology

An observing system simulation experiment (OSSE) is performed to investigate the effects of time-768 varying boundary layer. A nature run is first conducted from 0000 UTC 25 December 2015 to 769 0000 UTC 2 February 2016, forced by the time-invariant source emissions PR2010 (the true 770 emission). Synthetic observations of the six conventional air pollutant concentrations (i.e.,  $PM_{10}$ , 771 PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, and CO) are generated from the natural run. Hourly synthetic observations 772 are created from 0000 UTC 29 December 2015 to 0006 UTC 1 February 2016, by interpolating 773 the gridded true surface concentrations to the chemical observation locations with additive random 774 errors of N(0, R). R is the observation error variance, which is calculated by the formula in Elbern 775 et al. (2007). Outputs from the first four days of the natural run are excluded to avoid the transient 776 effect. Then the prior emissions are generated by  $F^{pr} = (1.8 + \delta(x, y, z, t))F^{tr}$ , where  $F^{tr}$  is the true 777 emission,  $\delta$  is a random number sampled from the normal distribution N(0,1) (Peng et al. 2015). 778 Ensemble data assimilation experiments are conducted from 0000 UTC 29 December to 0006 UTC 779 780 1 February 2016. Outputs from the first two days of the OSSE are excluded due to the spin-up.

The magnitude of posterior  $PM_{2.5}$  emission is closer to the true emission than the prior. Figure S1 781 presents the monthly mean diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction from the OSSE. It shows 782 that a little larger estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions occurred in the morning and smaller 783 estimated PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions occurred in the afternoon, comparing to the time-invariant true 784 emission. But the diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fractions caused by the boundary layer are 785 not as strong as that caused by the emission itself (Figure 7). The reason may be that we have 786 hourly assimilated observations to simultaneously update the chemical concentrations and source 787 emissions. Therefore, the impacts of time-varying boundary layer on the posterior PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions 788 789 are limited.



Figure S1. Diurnal variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission fraction for the Observing System Simulation
 Experiment.