Complementary aerosol mass spectrometry elucidates sources of wintertime sub-micron particle pollution in Fairbanks, Alaska, during ALPACA 2022

Amna Ijaz[1,2], Brice Temime-Roussel[1], Benjamin Chazeau[1], Sarah Albertin[3], Stephen R. Arnold[4], Brice Barret[5], Slimane Bekki[6], Natalie Brett[6], Meeta Cesler-Maloney[7], Elsa Dieudonne[8], Kayane K. Dingilian[9], Javier Fochesatto[10], Jingqiu Mao[7], Allison Moon[11], Joel Savarino[3], William Simpson[7], Rodney J. Weber[9], Kathy S. Law[6], Barbara D'Anna[1]

[1]Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, LCE, Marseille, France
[2]Present Address: Atmospheric, Climate, & Earth Sciences Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington 99354, United States
[3]University of Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, IRD, Grenoble INP, INRAE, IGE, F-38000 Grenoble, France
[4]School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom
[5]Laboratoire d'Aérologie, Université Toulouse III-Paul Sabatier, CNRS, Toulouse, France
[6]Sorbonne Université, UVSQ, CNRS, LATMOS-IPSL, Paris, France
[7]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AK, United States
[8]Laboratory of Physics and Chemistry of the Atmosphere, University of Littoral and Opal Coast, Dunkerque, France
[9]School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, United States
[10]Department of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AK, United States
[11]Department of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195, United States

Correspondence to: Barbara D'Anna (barbara.danna@univ-amu.fr) and Amna Ijaz (amna.ijaz@pnnl.gov)

Fairbanks, Alaska, is a sub-arctic city that frequently suffers from non-attainment of national air quality standards in the wintertime due to the coincidence of weak atmospheric dispersion and increased local emissions. ~~However, significant uncertainties exist about aerosol sources, formation, and chemical processes during cold winter periods. We identified and quantified various local sources using source apportionment approach and could determine the their chemical composition, size distribution, and concentrations of atmospheric sub-micron non-refractory particulate matter (NR-PM$_1$) emitted from them and quantify their sources in the urban centre of Fairbanks.~~ As part of the Alaskan Layered Pollution and Chemical Analysis (ALPACA) campaign, we deployed a Chemical Analysis of Aerosol Online (CHARON) inlet coupled with a proton transfer reaction - time of flight mass spectrometer (PTR-ToF MS) and an Aerodyne high-resolution aerosol mass spectrometer (AMS) to measure organic aerosol (OA) and NR-PM$_1$, respectively. We deployed Positive Matrix Factorisation (PMF) analysis for source identification of the NR-PM$_1$. ~~The PTR$_{CHARON}$ factorisation identified four residential heating sources, with oil combustion accounting for 16 ± 9% and wood combustion contributing to 47 ± 20% of the OA. The analysis could further differentiate between hardwood and softwood combustion. In contrast,~~ The AMS analysis identified three primary factors: ~~a single~~ biomass burning, ~~a~~ hydrocarbon-like and cooking factors which together accounted for 28, 38 and 11 % of the total OA, respectively. Additionally, a combined organic and inorganic PMF analysis revealed two further factors: one enriched in nitrates and another rich in sulphates of organic and inorganic origin. The PTR$_{CHARON}$ factorization could identify four primary sources from residential heating - one from oil combustion and three wood combustion, categorised as ~~types (~~low temperature, softwood, and hardwood~~)~~. Collectively, all residential heating factors accounted for 79% of the total OA. ~~c~~Cooking and road transport were also recognised as primary contributors to overall emission profile provided by PTR$_{CHARON}$. All PMF could apportion a single secondary organic fraction. These results evidence the complementarity of the two instruments and their ability in describing the complex chemical composition of PM$_1$ and the related sources. ~~These results demonstrate that~~ This work further demonstrates the capability of PTR$_{CHARON}$ to provide both ~~generates~~ qualitative and quantitative information offering ~~with enhanced~~a comprehensive understanding of the organic aerosol sources. ~~resolution of organic aerosol sources.~~ Such ~~When combined with suitable complementary instruments like the AMS, such evidence-based~~ insights into the sources of sub-micron aerosol ~~pollution~~ can assist environmental regulators and citizen efforts to improve ~~for the improvement in~~ air quality in Fairbanks and ~~in~~ the ~~wider~~ fast-urbanising regional sub-Arctic areas.

Keywords PM$_1$, mass spectrometry, source apportionment, organic and inorganic aerosol, Fairbanks, Arctic cities, air quality, CHARON PTR-ToF MS, HR-ToF AMS, ~~proton transfer reaction~~residential heating, wood combustion

1 Introduction

Extremely cold urban regions of the Earth, such as in the Arctic, experience poor dispersion of atmospheric pollution, especially during the wintertime, when the unique meteorological characteristics, such as extremely low solar radiation and strong radiative cooling at the surface, are coupled with enhanced local anthropogenic emissions from heating, industry, and transport. A good example is the sub-arctic city of Fairbanks, Alaska, where air quality standards are frequently violated during the winters with concentrations of fine particulate matter (i.e., with aerodynamic diameters smaller than 2.5 µm; $PM_{2.5}$) exceeding the 24-h limit of 35 $\mu g/m^3$ defined by EPA's National Ambient Air Quality Standards (Dunleavy and Brune, 2020; Epa, n.d.). Not only is Fairbanks one of the cities with the most polluted wintertime air in the US, but it has also been declared a 'moderate non-attainment area' since 2009, and due to the persistence of the problem, it was reclassified as a 'severe non-attainment area' in 2017. Increased local anthropogenic emissions and poor atmospheric dispersion due to strong surface-based temperature inversions (> 0.5°C/m in the lowest 10 m above the ground) are major causes of wintertime pollution in the region (Tran and Mölders, 2011; Mayfield and Fochesatto, 2013). Many research studies have recognised biomass combustion as the major source of aerosol in Fairbanks (Ward et al., 2012; Wang and Hopke, 2014; Kotchenruther, 2016; Ye and Wang, 2020; Haque et al., 2021) that drives overall $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations across the city during strong temperature inversion conditions (Robinson et al., 2023). A comprehensive study covering three winters from 2008–2011 apportioned 60–80% of $PM_{2.5}$ mass at four locations in Fairbanks to emissions from residential wood stoves, open burning of biomass, outdoor boilers, and other solid-fuel combustion. (Ward et al., 2012). Source apportionment of year-round $PM_{2.5}$ in the past two decades [2008–2009 (Haque et al., 2021), 2005–2012 (Wang and Hopke, 2014), 2009–2014 (Kotchenruther, 2016), and 2013–2019 (Ye and Wang, 2020)] also revealed woodsmoke as a major contributor to $PM_{2.5}$ loads [47.5% (Haque et al., 2021), 40.5% (Wang and Hopke, 2014), ~52% (Kotchenruther, 2016), and ~19% (Ye and Wang, 2020)]. Wildfire activity and residential wood combustion are the major sources in summer and winter, respectively. The persistent role of wood-burning emissions in shaping the air quality of Fairbanks during winters triggered the implementation of a two-stage burn restriction in 2015 by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC). The ADEC advisories restricted the operation of solid-fuel heating devices and required alternative heat sources to be used on days with weak atmospheric dispersion and $PM_{2.5}$ > 25 $\mu g/m^3$ are observed or forecasted (Fye et al., 2009; Czarnecki, 2017; Jentgen, 2022). Sulphate has been observed to be the second largest component of $PM_{2.5}$ mass in Fairbanks (Ward et al., 2012; Wang and Hopke, 2014), forming ~33% of the annual average $PM_{2.5}$ mass (Ye and Wang, 2020). Isotope analyses have revealed 62% of this $PM_{2.5}$ sulphate to be primary (e.g., from residential heating oil combustion) during the winters (Moon et al., 2023).

The aforementioned studies on air quality in Fairbanks have focused on PM$_{2.5}$ even though PM$_1$ has been recognised as the major cause of negative health effects (Wang et al., 2015; Mainka and Zajusz-Zubek, 2019) due to its capability to spread deeper into the respiratory or cardiovascular systems (Meng et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2017). Currently, ~~PM$_1$ concentrations are not regulated globally, but its strong contribution to atmospheric PM$_{2.5}$ loads and impacts has implications for the attainment of the latter's regulatory limits.~~ efforts to monitor PM$_1$ are surprisingly scarce, even in~~ a~~ 'non-attaining' ~~city~~cities, such as Fairbanks, underscoring the need for a better characterisation of sub-micron aerosols to understand local sources~~emissions~~, ~~atmospheric processes,~~ chemical composition and ultimately to inform public health and support policy decisions. ~~even though characterising the chemical composition of sub-micron atmospheric aerosol and capturing the variation in their mass concentrations is key to unravelling the complexities of local emissions and their transformation in Fairbanks and, most importantly, to underscore the health and policy implications of atmospheric emissions.~~

Mass spectrometric techniques have advanced over the years, featuring greater mass accurancy, resolving power, and sensitivity. For instance, the Aerodyne high-resolution time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer (HR-ToF AMS; called AMS from hereon) is a well-established method for quantification of non-refractory NR-PM$_1$. Aerosol vapourisation at high temperatures and electron ionisation result in substantive molecular decomposition, facilitating quantification with high time resolution (Decarlo et al., 2006), but at the cost of molecular-level information~~resolution~~. ~~The lack of molecular-level information provided by AMS~~ This limitation has encouraged~~s~~ the rise of complementary techniques ~~to better understand both primary aerosol sources and secondary aerosol formation~~. For instance, extractive electrospray ionisation (EESI)-ToF MS has been successfully deployed in Beijing (Tong et al., 2021) and in Zurich to resolve multiple OA sources (Stefenelli et al., 2019a; Qi et al., 2019). Although the instrument ~~the EESI-ToF MS~~ provides molecular-level information, its quantitative response is variable and selective for polar species, preventing its independent application for ambient measurements. Other measurement methods, such as thermal desorption aerosol GC/MS flame ionisation detector (TAG)(Williams et al., 2006) and filter inlet for gases and aerosols chemical ionisation (FIGAERO-CIMS)-ToF MS (Lopez-Hilfiker et al., 2014), similarly offer better chemical resolution than the AMS, but a lower temporal resolution. Semi-continuous measurements, such as those from TAG and FIGAERO-CIMS, may not capture the rapid variation in sources.

To improve the analysis of sub-micron OA in ambient air, a novel inlet system called the chemical analysis for aerosol online (CHARON) was developed to collect real-time measurements (Eichler et al., 2015). This inlet minimises thermal and ionisation-induced fragmentation of sampled OA by employing a low-temperature vapourisation system (150°C ≤) and coupling with a relatively softer ~~and less selective~~ ionisation method, such as the proton-transfer reaction (PTR). The CHARON PTR-ToF MS (called PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ from hereon) was ~~first~~ successfully used for the characterisation of OA from ship exhaust (Eichler et al., 2017), ambient OA in Lyon, France, and Valencia, Spain, and OA source apportionment in Innsbruck, Austria (Mü~~L~~ller et al., 2017). Recently, the inlet was used to quantify individual compounds in laboratory-generated secondary organic aerosol (Lannuque et al., 2023) and complex mixtures, such as vehicular gasoline emissions and atmospheric organic matter (Piel et al., 2019; Kostenidou et al., 2024). ~~Additionally, the analyser (commonly a PTR-ToF-MS) coupled to the CHARON inlet~~ The system can measure gas-phase species as well, creating the opportunity to explore VOC precursor emissions or phase partitioning (Peng et al., 2023; Gkatzelis et al., 2018). Overall, $\mathrm{PTR}_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$ and AMS are complementary techniques; ~~that provide robust qualitative and quantitative infio. T~~the former features molecular level information of the OA faction ~~in contrast to the AMS,~~ but has limited ability to ~~analyse~~ detect particles ~~smaller than~~below 150 nm (Eichler et al., 2015); the latter ~~instrument~~ covers smaller particle size range (i.e., > 60 nm) and detects inorganic components too (Decarlo et al., 2006). Together they provide an excellent combination of real-time and quantitative data on atmospheric ambient aerosol.

The detailed composition of sub-micron aerosol ~~pollution in the deterioration of air quality~~ in Fairbanks ~~—~~and other anthropogenically influenced ~~regions of the~~ sub-~~wider~~ Arctic regions – is still not well-understood. To address this issue, we deployed a $\mathrm{PTR}_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$ and an AMS in the urban centre of Fairbanks during the ALPACA (Alaskan Layered Pollution and Chemical Analysis) campaign as part of the French CASPA (Climate-Relevant Aerosol Sources and Processes in the Arctic) project in January–February 2022 (Simpson et al. 2024). We aimed to determine the composition, concentrations, and sources of atmospheric NR-PM$_1$. In this paper, we present: (i) an intercomparison of the performance of the two instruments focusing on OA quantitation, (ii) the identification of major OA sources in Fairbanks ~~and their variation during the field campaign~~, and (iii) the source apportionment of organic and inorganic aerosol (e.g., ammonium, nitrate, and ~~sulphur~~sulphate). These findings highlight the synergistic benefits of combining multiple analytical techniques and emphasise how soft ionisation mass spectroscopic methods enhance molecular-level insights into particulate organic carbon. This integrated approach advances our understanding of the complex composition of particulate matter, offering valuable contributions to environmental characterisation and source apportionment studies. ~~The results obtained here demonstrates the capability of technique a $m/\Delta m$ of ~5000good mass resolution, combined with the soft ionisation of the $\mathrm{PTR}_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$,provide significant to capabilities for both molecular-level qualitative and quantitative data, and allowings a better better ultimately contributing to a better understanding of the complex composition of particulate organic carbonand its related sources.~~

2 Methodology

2.1 Field campaign

The data presented in this study were collected during the ALPACA campaign in Fairbanks, Alaska, US from January 20 to February 26, 2022. ALPACA is an international collaborative field experiment to understand sources of outdoor and indoor air pollution in the cold and dark conditions of Fairbanks' winter. The scientific objectives and broad preliminary findings of the experiment were recently reviewed (Simpson et al. 2024). All instruments used for this study were housed in a trailer parked at the Community and Technical College (CTC) of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks (64.84064°N, 147.72677°W; 136 m above sea level). The CTC is in the urban core of Fairbanks, close (within 40 m) to a major downtown road and parking area (Simpson et al. 2024); the west of this locality is dominated by residential activities, while the north and east have commercial activity.

The trailer was equipped with a suite of particle counters and mass spectrometers with high temporal resolutions (varying from 10 seconds to 2 minutes). A scanning mobility particle sizer (SMPS) and a multi-angle absorption photometer (MAAP) were utilised to measure the distribution of particles sized 15.1 to 661.2 nm and black carbon concentrations, respectively. A separate inlet was used for PM_1/$PM_{2.5}$/PM_{10} measurements conducted with a commercial optical particle counter (model OPC 1.109, Grimm Aerosol Technik) at a time resolution of 1 min. Two mass spectrometers, $\text{PTR}_{\text{CHARON}}$ (150-~~∼~~1000 nm) and AMS (60-700~~∼1000~~ nm), were connected to the same inlet that sampled air at 3.5 meters above ground level through a short (≈ 1 m) stainless tube with a 1/2" outer diameter extending through the trailer roof. A HEPA filter was placed upstream of the inlet for an hour at regular intervals (twice a week) to measure the instrumental background. Additionally, meteorological data, including ambient temperatures at 3 and 23 m; wind speed and direction; and trace gases, namely CO, SO_2, O_3, NO and NO_2, were recorded as described in a previous study associated with the campaign (Cesler-Maloney et al., 2022).

2.2 Instrumentation

2.2.1 PTR-ToF MS: ~~Operation~~ operation and data processing

The OA was quantified with a PTR-ToF MS (PTR-TOF 6000 X2, Ionicon Analytik GmbH, Austria) coupled to a CHARON inlet in near real-time at 20-s~~ec~~ temporal resolution, i.e., the $\text{PTR}_{\text{CHARON}}$. The CHARON inlet has been described in detail by Eichler et al (Eichler et al., 2015) and its applications were further evaluated and improved in subsequent studies (Mül~~L~~ler et al., 2017; Leglise et al., 2019; Müller et al., 2019; Piel et al., 2019; Peng et al., 2023). Here, the PTR-ToF MS was configured to alternate between ~~direct~~ sampling of ambient~~of~~ air to measure VOCs for 15 minutes (not included in the current study) and sampling of particulate matter through the CHARON inlet for 45 minutes. The instrument was operated at a low E/N of 65 Td (i.e., drift voltage/pressure; pressure, temperature, and voltage of the drift tube were set at 2.6 mbar, 120°C, and 265 V) and in RF mode for optimal sensitivity. The thermodesorber ~~in the CHARON inlet~~ was operated at 150°C and 8 mbar; this combination of moderate temperature with low pressure expands the range of detection to include ELVOCs as well (Piel et al. 2021). Raw data was obtained as described in **Section S1** and pre-processed with the Ionicon Data Analyzer (IDA, version 1.0.0.2), followed by post-processing (i.e., background subtraction, conversion of raw signal to mixing ratios, temporal averaging, PMF input generation) with an in-house data processing tool, PeTeR Toolkit (version 6.0; Igor 6.37). The error matrix was also calculated by PeTeR using uncertainties in ion counts and background signals. Among the resolved 1118 ions ~~resolved~~spanning the range of *m/z* 50–425, only 336 were retained above the S/N~~ with *m/z* 50–425~~, and 318 ions could be given a molecular formula based on the criteria described in **Section S2**. PTR ToF MS records raw signals in counts per second (cps) that were converted to mixing ratios according to the molecular identity determined for the detected ions and their protonation efficiencies (further details in **Section S1**). For comparison with the AMS, mixing ratios were converted to mass concentrations, i.e., μg/m^3, using **Equation S2**. Mass concentrations calculated for the PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ require a critical correction for the enrichment of sampled OA in the aerodynamic lens of the CHARON inlet (Eichler et al., 2015; ~~MüLler~~ Müller et al., 2017); further details are provided in **Section S3**. Total (or bulk) OA at a given point in time was the sum of mass concentrations of all ions, which was corrected for fragmentation using a previously reported method (Leglise et al., 2019), which increased the total OA mass concentrations by 17%.

Species with *m/z* > 50 ~~(the largest *m/z* detected above the S/N was 425)~~ were retained for PMF of OA,~~.~~ ~~Smaller~~ as molecules ~~of~~ between *m/z* 18–50 were presented in low concentrations and~~; they~~ are expected to be too volatile to be present in OA and were likely detected by PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ as artefacts from the denuder~~ function~~. Time series were averaged to 2 minutes (from 20 seconds) and two matrices (*m/z* × time points) were extracted: (i) ion concentrations and (ii) their measurement uncertainties, using PeTeR ~~version 6.0 in Igor 6.37~~. The final matrices ~~– after removing empty rows and columns –~~ had the following dimensions 336 × 17,986. Where required, ion intensities (in either ppb or μg/m^3) were normalised to the sum of all measured intensities.

2.2.2 HR-ToF-AMS: o~~O~~peration and data processing~~ of the AMS~~

NR-PM$_1$ was~~were~~ monitored with 1-minute time resolution by a high-resolution time-of-flight mass spectrometer (AMS) ~~-~~(Aerodyne Research Inc., Billerica, USA), extensively ~~with spectral acquisition~~

~~at 1-minute intervals. The instrument has been~~ described by ~~previously (~~Decarlo et al., (2006) and ~~;~~ Canagaratna et al~~,~~.(2007). Briefly, ambient particles are sampled through a critical orifice, focused into a narrow~~ed~~ beam by an aerodynamic lens, accelerated toward a standard vapouriser heated ~~element~~ at ~~(~~600°C~~) for flash vapourisation~~, and then ionised by electron impact (70 eV at 10^{-7} torr). Finally, the ions are analysed by a time-of-flight mass spectrometer. Standard calibrations were performed using 300 nm size-selected dried ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulphate particles at the beginning and the end of the campaign. Nitrate-equivalent values of sample mass concentrations were converted by applying relative ionisation efficiencies (RIEs) for organics, nitrates, ammonium, ~~sulphur~~sulphate, and chloride~~s~~ (1.4, 1.1, 3.15, 1.93, and 1.3, respectively). ~~For quantitative purposes, the c~~Collection efficiency (CE) ~~of particles must be considered as strongly viscous particles in the sampled air are prone to bouncing off the vapouriser~~has been calculated in PIKA using ~~, thereby suffering from reduced detection. We used the time series of~~the composition-dependent CE (CDCE) ~~generated by PIKA~~following ~~using a previously reported algorithm (~~Middlebrook et al., (2012) method. The calculated CE values ~~, which~~ ranged from 1.00 to 0.35.

Data was averaged to 2 minutes and extracted as concentration and measurement uncertainty matrices (*m/z* × time points) using SQUIRREL version 1.65 and PIKA version 1.25 in Igor 8.04. Separate matrices (and subsequently PMF) were prepared for organic only (abbreviated AMS_{org}) and by combining organic and inorganic species (abbreviated $AMS_{org+inorg}$). The inorganic species included in the analyses were nitrate~~s~~ (*m/z* 30, NO^+ and 46, NO_2^+), ~~sulphur~~ sulphate (*m/z* 48, SO^+; 64, SO_2^+; 80, SO_3^+; 81, HSO_3^+; and 98, $H_2SO_4^+$), ammonium (*m/z* 15, NH^+; 16, NH_2^+; and 17, NH_3^+), and chloride~~s~~ (*m/z* 35, Cl^+ and 36, HCl^+). Error matrices were calculated by PIKA based on uncertainty in ion counts, background signal, air beam correction, and electronic noise (Sueper, 2014). Atomic O/C and H/C ratios were calculated based on established methods (Aiken et al., 2007; Aiken et al., 2008; Canagaratna et al., 2015). Where needed for comparison with the PTR_{CHARON}, mass concentrations of PAHs were estimated from fragments as described previously (Herring et al., 2015), and levoglucosan was estimated as detailed in **Section S4**.

Species with *m/z* 12–120 were retained for PMF in this study, excluding important PAHs detected up to *m/z* 252; such PAHs were used as external tracers for factor identification. All PAHs were included in total OA quantification and associated comparisons. This exclusion is expected to cause underestimation below the 2% ~~(by <2%)~~ of the mass of some factors, particularly HOA (hydrocarbon-like organic aerosol) and BBOA (biomass-burning organic aerosol). ~~After removing empty rows and columns,~~Final matrices from AMS_{org} and $AMS_{org+inorg}$ analyses had the following dimensions: 193 × 24,762 and 205 × 24,762, respectively.

2.3 Source apportionment: Positive matrix factorisation

Source apportionment was performed using a PMF implemented in the multilinear engine (ME-2) (Paatero, 1997a, 1999). The PMF was configured and analysed using the SoFi (Source Finder) Pro interface (Canonaco et al., 2013) (version 8.4.1.9.1; Igor 8.04). PMF is a descriptive mathematical algorithm that describes the input data, i.e. measurements of several variables collected over time (here, *m/z* × sampling time points), as a linear combination of factors that have constant mass spectra associated with temporally varying concentrations of the spectral constituents (Paatero, 1997b; Paatero and Tapper, 1994)~~; each of the factors is representative of an emission source~~. The mathematical expressions and functions of the PMF algorithm have been exhaustively detailed in previous studies (e.g., refs. (Tong et al., 2021; Stefenelli et al., 2019a; Chen et al., 2022; Chazeau et al., 2022), etc.). Below we summarise the user-defined configurations applied in SoFi Pro to optimise the PMF of our datasets, PTR_{CHARON}, AMS_{org}, and $AMS_{org+inorg}$. ~~The results were compared in terms of identified sources and the mass of OA (or total NR-PM_1) apportioned to each source.~~

2.3.1. General methodology for PMF analysis

Preliminary PMF was performed without using *a priori* information ~~, i.e., the so-called unconstrained factorisation,~~ to ~~understand the data~~explore ~~the structure of the dataset, potential~~ factor variability, ~~preliminary~~ source contributions, and guide the selection of an optimal solution before applying constraints. ~~These unconstrained trials explored tested~~We considered solutions ranging from 3 ~~three~~ to 13 factors~~.~~, applying a ~~Cell-wise,~~ step-wise, cell-wise ~~-~~down-weighting ~~was applied~~approach~~,~~ : ~~whereby~~ variables with S/N < 0.2 (“bad” variables) were down-weighted by a factor of 10, while those with ~~or~~ 0.2 < S/N < 2 (“weak” variables) were down-weighted by a factor of ~~10 and~~ 2~~, respectively~~ (Paatero and Hopke, 2003; Ulbrich et al., 2009). Upon establishing some ~~that~~ primary factors, ~~e.g.,~~ such as cooking and biomass burning, which ~~could~~ were successfully identified ~~readily be factorised~~ in unconstrained trials, we narrowed ~~explored only a subset of~~ the range of possible solutions by applying the a-value approach, which allows for ~~directing the PMF toward meaningful solutions with the *a*-value approach. For this approach, the user can~~ improve factorisation ~~results~~ by constraining the PMF with external data~~, if~~ when available (Canonaco et al., 2013; Paatero, 1999). For instance, a factor profile from a PMF trial in the same experiment, a time series from an external tracer ~~from the same campaign~~, or a well-established factor profile for a source from another experiment may be provided to the PMF as an ‘anchor/vector’ around which it can build a factor in its overall solution. The extent to which each PMF factor can diverge from the anchor is defined by the value of *a* (Tong et al., 2021), which varies from 0 to 1~~, where 0 = no divergence and 1 = up to 100% divergence~~. This anchor can be provided for one or multiple factors and has been proven to improve the quality of PMF solutions compared to unconstrained trials (Tong et al., 2021; Stefenelli et al., 2019a; Chen et al., 2022).

Currently, there are no fully objective criteria for choosing the best number of factors~~ in a solution~~, but ~~; ~~some criteria have been suggested in the literature to make an appropriate selection (Chen et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2011; Ulbrich et al., 2009; Crippa et al., 2014). The PMF solutions reported here were primarily selected based on their ~~-~~physical meaning~~interpretability~~, which was ~~in turn, ~~determined by the presence of ~~the distribution of ~~known tracer compounds in the factors, temporal correlation with co-located measurements of external tracers (e.g., NO_x, SO_2).~~, and the temporal agreement of factors determined by the two instruments~~. We selected an ~~esolved ~~eight, four, and six factors solution from PTR_{CHARON}, AMS_{org}, and $AMS_{org+inorg}$, respectively. The justification for these solutions ~~choices ~~is presented in **Table S2**. Once the most suitable solution, i.e., the base-case, was established, bootstrap analyses were performed to assess its stability, evaluate uncertainties, and conduct a sensitivity analysis on the range of *a*-values used. In an unblocked bootstrapping approach, the original matrices (both data and error) are perturbed by random resampling of the rows to create a new input of the same dimensions, resulting in some duplications and deletions throughout the input (Paatero et al., 2014). The need and application of this approach differed between the PTR_{CHARON} and the two AMS datasets as discussed in **Sections S5** and **S6**, respectively. Ancillary data on particle size distribution ~~in ~~have been associated to mass spectrometry data in an additional PMF analysis ~~each factor was generated by a fully constrained PMF or simple linear regressions of the SMPS datasets ~~(**Section S7**). Finally, the quality of solutions was gauged by the Q/Q_{exp} values and from key diagnostic plots of residuals and the statistical stability across multiple runs (**Figure S5–S7**).

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Campaign overview

Figure 1 summarises ~~depicts a summary ~~meteorological conditions, chemical composition and particle size distribution of NR-PM_1 observed from January 20 to February 26, 2022. High aerosol loads coincided with poor atmospheric dispersion, due to low wind speeds (<2 m/s), low temperature (below - 10°C) associated with strong surface temperature inversions, as temperature differences between 23 and 3 m above sea level ranging from 3°C to 10°C. The ~~campaign ~~average values~~s~~ of BC and NR-PM_1 measured with the MAAP and AMS were **1.4 ± 1.4 µg/m^3** and **8.3 ± 9.3 µg/m^3**, respectively. ~~Intense~~ During intense pollution events ~~episodes occurred from Jan 31 to Feb 02, during which the ~~daily average concentrations of NR-PM_1 were **24–27 µg/m^3**. ~~For this polluted period, another ALPACA study ~~During the same sampling period at NCore site (Fairbanks) ~~reported campaign-averaged ~~$PM_{2.5}$ value of ~25 and ~29 µg/m^3 were reported ~~at NCore (a monitoring station located approximately 580 m from the CTC) using a beta attenuation mass monitor and a nearby site of Downtown using a DustTrak DRX~~

~~aerosol monitor~~ (Robinson et al., 2023). ~~In our study, the hourly PM_1 concentrations measured at the CTC site comprised up to 99% of the $PM_{2.5}$ measured with an OPC, warranting that future studies in Fairbanks must explore the distribution, dynamics, and impacts of sub-micron aerosol to gauge the need for its targeted mitigation.~~ Ancillary OPC measurements at the CTC site showed that the hourly PM_1 mass comprised up to 99% of the $PM_{2.5}$.

Organics were the predominant component of NR-PM_1 throughout the campaign, constituting **~66 ± 11**% of its total mass, while chloride, ammonium, nitrate, and ~~sulphur~~sulphate ~~-based inorganics~~ contributed **2 ± 3, 3 ± 3**, **6 ± 4**, and **22 ± 10**%. This is in line with previous studies in Fairbanks, where OA was the largest component of $PM_{2.5}$ mass (Ward et al., 2012; Ye and Wang, 2020; Robinson et al., 2024). Specifically, according to a recent study from 2020 to 2021, ACSM analysis during the wintertime demonstrated inorganics to form less than 25% of the $PM_{2.5}$ mass only, with sulphate (~10%) and nitrate (~8%) being the predominant components (Robinson et al., 2024). Despite the different average concentrations, the fractional contributions of these non-refractory components remained almost invariable throughout the campaign (**Figure 1D**). Detailed molecular-level composition of organics with the PTR_{CHARON} reveals a large majority of organics to comprise only C, H, and/or O atoms, while only **~9 ± 4%** of the OA_{CHARON} mass measured with this instrument was attributable to heteroatomic ~~species~~molecules, including organonitrates and organosulphates (**Figure 4 and S8**). Generally, heteroatomic species cannot be distinguished at a resolving power of 5000 FWHM in complex environmental mixtures, such as atmospheric aerosol (Reemtsma, 2009). In this study, based on the low formula error and lack of an appropriate alternate, we gave 53 low-concentration ions (< 2% of the total signal) CHOS or CHNO identities, but due to the low confidence in their formula assignments, they were not considered for factor identification. Prominent peaks include *m/z* 217.09 ($C_{12}H_{12}N_2O_2$), 219.09 ($C_{15}H_{10}N_2$), 123.05 ($C_4H_{10}O_2S$), and 151.08 ($C_6H_{14}O_2S$).

On average, the OA mass loading recovered by PTR_{CHARON} (i.e., OA_{CHARON}) accounted for approximately 85% of the OA mass measured by the AMS (i.e., OA_{AMS}). While the two instruments showed a ~~strong~~ good temporal agreement ($R^2 = 0.60$) as depicted in **Figures 2A–B**, measurements were biased either toward the AMS_{org} or the PTR_{CHARON} (i.e., distributed away from the 1:1 line in the scatter plot of **Figure 2C**) during different periods of the campaign. These trends could be explained by the variation in relative contributions of two major emission sources identified by both instruments in this study: on-road ~~traffic~~transport and biomass burning. OA_{CHARON} was comparable to OA_{AMS}, when the relative contribution of $BBOA_{AMS,org}$ was more than 50% of total OA_{AMS} and $HOA_{AMS,org}$ (i.e., ~~traffic~~$transport_{CHARON}$) was less than 10% (**Figure 2D–E**). Similar trends were observed for some major constituents of BBOA, e.g., levoglucosan and a PAH ($C_{20}H_{12}$) as shown in **Figure S9**. Part of such discrepancy ~~This relationship of instrument performance with the source~~ can be traced back to the size transmission of particles, where sub-100 nm urban vehicular emissions are underestimated by the PTR$_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$ (Guo et al., 2020; Pikridas et al., 2015; Louis et al., 2017; Kostenidou et al., 2020), and larger than 100 nm biomass burning emissions (Reid et al., 2005) are estimated well (Janhäll et al., 2010). Another p~~P~~art of the quantitative difference ~~between the two instruments~~ can ~~also~~ be explained by the ~~detection abilities of~~ PTR limitation in ionisation and the ~~ionisation~~ induced fragmentation of analyte ions. ~~during PTR ionisation that introduces a negative biaThis Only abias has been reported to be small underestimation of for oxidised organic compounds has been reported with the PTR$_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$ that can be corrected using previously proposed methods (Leglise et al., 2019). Contrarily, Additional~~ T~~t~~ests ~~carried out~~conducted in our laboratory with five C_{16}–C_{26} alkanes as markers of vehicle emissions revealed that they undergo extensive fragmentation, ~~increases dramatically and~~ resultings in ~~a~~ 2–4 times underestimation of their actual concentrations. In line with this, t~~T~~he ineffective ionisation of saturated alkanes by PTR (Ellis and Mayhew, 2014) and their tendency ~~of alkanes from vehicular exhausts~~ to undergo dissociative ~~PTR~~ ionisation ~~has also been reported previously~~ (Gueneron et al., 2015) ~~has~~have also been reported.

3.2 Source apportionment

3.2.1. Overview of source apportionment

A four-factor solution was selected for the AMS$_{\mathrm{org}}$ measurements with three primary factors (i.e., HOA, COA, and BBOA) and an oxygenated or aged OA factor (i.e., OOA). The mass spectra and time series are presented in the supplement (**Figure S10**). Counterparts of these four factors were diagnosed in AMS$_{\mathrm{org+inorg}}$ based on a high temporal correlation ($R^2 > 0.9$; Table S4), along with two additional factors: a sulphur-rich factor (labelled sulph-OA) and a nitrate-rich factor (labelled AmNi) (**Figure 3**). An eight-factor solution was selected for PTR$_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$ and is summarised in **Figures 4 and 5**. To differentiate between corresponding factors retrieved from the different datasets, they have been given unique subscripts, e.g. COA$_{\mathrm{AMS,org}}$, COA$_{\mathrm{AMS,org+inorg}}$, COA$_{\mathrm{AMS}}$ (i.e., referring to both AMS datasets), or COA$_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$. Amongst the three datasets COA, HOA (labelled '~~traffic~~transport' in PTR$_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$ analyses), and OOA were common. A single BBOA factor was observed in AMS$_{\mathrm{org}}$ and AMS$_{\mathrm{org+inorg}}$, while four chemically distinct, but closely co-varying counterparts were detected by PTR$_{\mathrm{CHARON}}$.

3.2.2. Organic aerosol from residential heating.

Both AMS analyses indicate that biomass burning is among the major sources of PM$_1$ during the ALPACA campaign. On average, BBOA contributed **1.5 ± 1.9 μg/m^3** (**28 ± 18%** of total OA$_{\mathrm{AMS}}$) and **1.6 ± 2.2 μg/m^3** NR-PM$_1$ (**19 ± 14%** of total NR-PM$_1$ mass). The mass spectra of BBOA$_{\mathrm{AMS}}$ featured a strong peak at *m/z* 60 ($C_2H_4O_2^+$) and 73 ($C_3H_5O_2^+$) (**Figure S10A–B**). These fragments are markers of anhydrosugars in wood-forming polymers, such as cellulose(Tobler et al., 2021). Wood combustion has previously been estimated to be the largest emitter of aerosols in Fairbanks and surrounding areas, where it may produce as much as 80% of the aerosol load (Haque et al., 2021; Ward et al., 2012; Wang and Hopke, 2014; Kotchenruther, 2016). Wood burning emissions are also the major driver of the spatial variability of $PM_{2.5}$ and BC in Fairbanks during strong atmospheric temperature inversions (Robinson et al., 2023). Other typical residential heating sources of emissions in Fairbanks include coal, gas, and fuel oil (Simpson et al., 2019).

The $BBOA_{AMS}$ factor was strongly correlated with PAHs ($R^2 \geq 0.7$) while a ~~. In addition, a~~ moderate correlation was observed with SO_2 ($R^2 = 0.4$) (**Table 1**). While PAHs are a major component of biomass combustion emissions, the emission of SO_2 is largely associated with coal and oil combustion (Smith et al., 2011; Dunleavy and Brune, 2019). However, the AMS was unable to distinguish between multiple combustion-related sources. As shown in the diurnal plots in **Figure 3**, the concentration of the $BBOA_{AMS}$ factor enhanced at ~1800 AKST, stayed stable through the night and then decreased in the early morning. Its lowest mass concentrations occurred during the afternoon (1300–1500 AKST). Therefore, $BBOA_{AMS}$ was ~~could be~~ associated with residential heating, i.e., the combustion of a variety of fuels by residents within their homes (non-commercially), such as in wood-burning stoves, furnaces, boilers, etc. for heating living space. We did not find evidence of OA or $NR\text{-}PM_1$ from commercial heat providers, such as power plants, likely due to their small contribution to surface-level aerosol due to smokestacks lying above the inversion layer.

PTR_{CHARON} apportioned **2.6 ± 3.4** μg/m^3 of OA_{CHARON}, on average, to four distinct residential heating-related sources expressed as ResH1–4 (**62 ± 26%** of total OA_{CHARON}). These factors closely co-varied in time and were correlated reasonably well ($R^2 = 0.5$–0.7; **Table S5**) with the $BBOA_{AMS}$ factor. In addition, combining all four residential heating-related factors in PTR_{CHARON} into a composite factor increased the correlation (R^2) with AMS_{org} and $AMS_{org+inorg}$ to 0.79 and 0.82, respectively, suggesting that PMF was not able to effectively separate these closely co-varying residential heating factors ~~when their molecular signatures were weakened due to the extensive EI-induced fragmentation~~ in AMS dataset.

The four factors from PTR_{CHARON} were identified as different sources based on the distribution of key marker species and correlation with external (e.g., trace gases, etc.) and internal (e.g., PAHs). ~~measured with co-located instruments; particle size distribution) tracers~~. ~~The l~~Levoglucosan ~~signal~~ is used here as an internal tracer of biomass burning being ~~because it is~~ relatively stable under ~~typical~~ atmospheric conditions (Fraser and Lakshmanan, 2000). ~~A majority of the signal from p~~Protonated levoglucosan (*m/z* 163) and its fragments (at *m/z* 85, 127, and 145) were found ~~appeared~~ in ResH1, ResH4, and ResH2 with **30, 26, 14%** of the total signal respectively **(Figure S11)**~~in the same order)~~, ~~with only minor~~

~~association with ResH3accounted for~~ suggesting that they ~~the former three to~~ originate from biomass ~~burning – more specifically,~~ wood-burning (**Figure 4 and S11**). These three ~~wood-burning related~~ factors collectively accounted for ~~produced an average of~~ **2.1 ± 2.5 µg/m^3** (~~of OA$_{CHARON}$ (~~**47 ± 20%**) of total factorised OA$_{CHARON}$~~)~~.

ResH1 includes low temperature combustion markers: this factor is small as it contributes to only an average of **0.5 ± 0.5 µg/m^3 (14%)** of the total OA $_{CHARON}$, but it contains the highest fraction of levoglucosan (~30%). Approximately 65% of the total signal of ResH1 is due to compounds with six or fewer carbon atoms, compared to heavier species present in the other factors (**Figure S13**). The most abundant species are at *m/z* 69.03 (C_4H_4O; furan) (Palm et al., 2020; Jiang et al., 2019), m/z 87.04 ($C_4H_6O_2$; oxobutanal) (Brégonzio-Rozier et al., 2015), *m/z* 97.03 ($C_5H_4O_2$; furfural), *m/z* 109.0286 ($C_6H_4O_2$; benzoquinone) (Stefenelli et al., 2019b) and *m/z* 115.04 ($C_5H_6O_3$; methyl-dihydrofuran) (Koss et al., 2018). Consistent with these molecular formulae, the concentration-weighted average O/C of ResH1 was relatively higher (i.e., 0.42) compared to other residential heating factors (O/C = 0.2–0.3). The most abundant species observed in ResH1 can be related to depolymerisation reactions occurring during low temperature and early stages of the combustion process (Collard and Blin, 2014; Sekimoto et al., 2018). ~~***ResH1 includes mixed wood-burning OA:*** Although ResH1 had the strongest levoglucosan signal, it contributed the least OA with an average of **0.5 ± 0.5 µg/m^3** and did not feature any other prominent wood-burning tracers, such as PAHs. As shown in **Figure S13**, ~65% of the total signal of ResH1 came from compounds with six or fewer carbon atoms, compared to heavier species in other factors. Many species with the greatest concentrations in ResH1, relative to other factors, have been reported as oxidation products of BBOA ageing in previous studies, such as *m/z* 69.03 (C_4H_4O; furan) (Palm et al., 2020; Jiang et al., 2019), *m/z* 87.04 ($C_4H_6O_2$; oxobutanal) (Brégonzio-Rozier et al., 2015), *m/z* 97.03 ($C_5H_4O_2$; furfural), and *m/z* 109.0286 ($C_6H_4O_2$; benzoquinone)(Stefenelli et al., 2019b). Collectively, ResH1 comprises OA from the combustion of a variety of mixed wood-based solid fuels as evidenced by the presence of levoglucosan, but it also likely includes OA in the early stages of processing.~~

ResH2 and ResH4 include OA from hardwood and pinewood combustion, respectively: Two more factors associated with wood-burning were ResH2 and ResH4. Their average ~~OA$_{CHARON}$~~ concentrations were **1.1 ± 1.9** and **0.8 ± 0.9 µg/m^3**, respectively, corresponding to **28** and **20%** of the OA$_{CHARON}$ (**Figure 6**). ~~As shown in **Figure 6A**,~~ The ResH2 was dominant factor in the PMF ~~of PTR$_{CHARON}$ that~~and could reach **~37 µg/m^3** ~~of OA$_{CHARON}$ alone~~ during the most severe pollution episodes. ~~Not only did these~~ Both factors ~~correspond to~~ were associated to ~~OA~~ particles ~~sizes~~ greater than 300 nm (**Figure S12**), ~~which is~~ typical of woodsmoke (Glasius et al., 2006), and ~~but they also~~ presented unique molecular signatures of different wood types ~~as shown in~~ (**Figure S11**)~~ and discussed next~~. Generally, the specific nature of wood cannot be inferred unambiguously because the emissions of known marker species, such as levoglucosan or methoxy phenols, vary not just with fuel used and its quality, but also with the type of heating appliance, operational conditions, appliance efficiency, and stage in the combustion cycle (Fine et al., 2002; Alves et al., 2017). Regardless, several studies (Fine et al., 2002; Schauer and Cass, 2000; Kawamoto, 2017) have distinguished between softwood from hardwood by investigating the presence of marker compounds that were observed in our study as well, such as substituted phenols and resin acids **(Figure S11).**

ResH2 featured an abundance of ~~of prominent~~ methoxy phenols, including $C_7H_8O_2$ (guaiacol), $C_8H_{10}O_3$ (syringol), $C_{10}H_{10}O_3$ (coniferaldehyde), $C_6H_6O_2$ (benzenediol ~~(catechol)~~ or methylfurfural), and $C_8H_{10}O_2$ (creosol), that ~~where they~~ collectively accounted for ~9% of the total signal, compared to 1, 2, and 2% in ResH1, ResH3, and ResH4, respectively. These compounds are important products of lignin pyrolysis in birch, aspen, and spruce and are usually ~~found~~ detected in the gas phase at mild ambient temperatures (Kong et al., 2021). Guaiacol and syringol are depolymerisation products of guaiacyl and syringyl units of lignin at 200–400°C, and they rapidly transition to catechols, cresols, and phenols during secondary pyrolysis reactions at 400–450°C~~, eventually leading to enhanced PAH formation at >700°C~~ (Kawamoto, 2017). While guaiacols are emitted ~~to some extent~~ by ~~the burning of~~ both hardwood and softwood, semi- or low-volatility substituted syringols ~~that primarily exist in the condensed phase~~ are emitted in ~~much~~ higher amounts by hardwood combustion (Kawamoto, 2017; Fine et al., 2002, 2001; Schauer and Cass, 2000). In this study, derivatives of guaiacols, including $C_{10}H_{12}O_2$ (eugenol), $C_{10}H_{14}O_2$ (4-propyl guaiacol), and $C_{10}H_{10}O_3$ (coniferaldehyde) presented ~~much~~ higher "relative concentration" ~~concentrations~~ (**Equation S4**) of 0.56–1.41 for ResH2 and ResH4 compared to ~~< 0 for~~ ResH1 (<0). Other compounds, such as $C_8H_8O_3$ (vanillin), $C_9H_{10}O_3$ (acetovanillone), $C_{10}H_{12}O_3$ (propiovanillone), and $C_{10}H_{12}O_4$ (methyl homovanillate) were predominantly found in ResH2. Similarly, substituted syringols, i.e., $C_{11}H_{14}O_3$ (methoxy eugenol), $C_{10}H_{12}O_4$ (acetosyringone), and $C_{11}H_{14}O_4$ (syringyl acetone, propionyl syringol, or sinapyl alcohol) were almost entirely associated with ResH2 as well. These compounds have been reported as markers of hardwood burning (Fine et al., 2001), implying a ~~potentially~~ greater contribution of hardwood emissions ~~smoke~~ to the ResH2 factor. In Alaska, relevant hardwood species include deciduous leafy trees, i.e., paper birch, balsam poplar, quaking aspen, etc (Adec, 2023).

~~For~~ The ResH4~~, in addition to the levoglucosan marker ions, a predominance of large~~presented a unique fingerprint characterised by~~,~~ oxygenated molecules ~~with more~~bearing more than 13 carbon atoms ~~was observed~~ (**Figure S13**), such as $C_{16}H_{30}O_6$ (*m/z* 319.21), $C_{20}H_{28}O_2$ (*m/z* 301.21), ~~$C_{22}H_{18}O$ (*m/z* 299.14),~~ $C_{20}H_{18}O_4$ (*m/z* 323.12), ~~and~~ $C_{20}H_{30}O_2$ (*m/z* 303.24) and $C_{22}H_{18}O$ (*m/z* 299.14), in addition to the levoglucosan marker ions (26% of the total signal). ~~Amongst these, more than 60% of the~~The intense signals from *m/z* 301 ($C_{20}H_{28}O_2$) and *m/z* 303 ($C_{20}H_{30}O_2$) ~~was associated with ResH4~~ (**Figure S11**) ~~.~~ ~~These species~~ are likely related to resin acids, dehydroabietic acid and abietic acid, respectively, which are almost exclusively emitted from the thermal alteration of resins in coniferous species, and thus, are indicative of softwood burning (Simoneit, 2002, 1999). ~~Owing~~ Due to the presence of these compounds, ResH4 was ~~identified~~ interpreted as an OA factor influenced by softwood combustion. Softwood species in Alaska include trees with needles and cones, e.g. hemlock, cedar, and spruce (Adec, 2023).

ResH3 includes OA from heating oil combustion: this factor ~~A factor, labelled ResH3,~~ contributed to **16 ± 9%** of the total OA_{CHARON} (**0.6 ± 0.6 μg/m**^{3}) and showed the characteristic diurnal pattern of residential heating as it ~~. It~~ correlated quite well (R^2 = 0.56) with $BBOA_{AMS,org}$. However, its chemical composition was ~~very~~ different from the other residential heating factors. Notably, levoglucosan contributed to a smaller fraction of the total signal of ResH3 (i.e., 9%) compared to other residential heating factors (~~13~~14–~~29~~30%; **Figure S11**), ~~but~~ while PAHs represented a much larger fraction of its total signal (for instance, 30, 31, and 29% of $C_{16}H_{10}$ (*m/z* 203.09), $C_{18}H_{12}$ (*m/z* 229.10), and $C_{20}H_{12}$ (*m/z* 253.10); **Figure S13**). These PAHs could be fluoranthene (or pyrene), naphthacene (or benzo[*x*]anthracene, chrysene), and benzo(*x*)pyrene (or benzo(*x*)fluoranthene)), which have been reported in emissions of light oil combustion (Bari et al., 2009). Additionally, ResH3 was strongly correlated with SO_2 (R_2 = 0.61) ~~during the campaign~~, compared to a ~~moderate~~ lower correlation (R^2 ~~of~~ ≤ 0.47) with the other ~~the remaining~~ residential heating factors. Residential combustion of heating oil is an important source of SO_2 in Fairbanks, compared to wood and coal, due to ~2/3rd of the households using oil-fired space heaters and the high sulphur content of > 1600 ppm in fuel oils commonly consumed here (e.g., #1 and #2 fuel oil and waste motor oil are relevant in Fairbanks)(Dunleavy and Brune, 2019). Consistent with the possibility of the ResH3 factor ~~denoting~~ being associated with fuel oil emissions, the factor is characterised by particles smaller than 100 nm (**Figure S12**) and due to the CHARON inlet's cut-off, its mass concentration was possibly ~~fuel oil emissions, a fully constrained PMF on SMPS measurements matched it with particles smaller than 100 nm (Figure S12). Due to the small particle size, it is possible that mass concentrations of~~ ~~OA_{CHARON}~~ ~~were~~ under~~-apportioned to~~estimated. ~~ResH3; this possibility is discussed in detail for the on-road traffic factor in the next section.~~

3.2.3. Hydrocarbon-like ~~and cooking~~ organic aerosol

The HOA_{AMS} factors were characterised by notable peaks at *m/z* 43 ($C_3H_7^+$), 57 ($C_4H_9^+$), 71 ($C_5H_{11}^+$), 85 ($C_6H_{13}^+$), and 99 ($C_7H_{15}^+$), belonging to $[C_nH_{2n+1}]^+$ series, ~~that are~~ typical of *n*- and branched alkanes. ~~There were also~~ Additional peaks at *m/z* 55 ($C_4H_7^+$), 69 ($C_5H_9^+$), 81 ($C_6H_9^+$), 83 ($C_6H_{11}^+$), 95 ($C_7H_{11}^+$), 97 ($C_7H_{13}^+$), 107 ($C_8H_{11}^+$), 109 ($C_8H_{13}^+$), and 111 ($C_8H_{15}^+$) ~~that belong to~~ represented $[C_nH_{2n-1}]^+$ and

$[C_nH_{2n-3}]^+$ series, related to ~~which are typical indicative of~~ cycloalkanes (McLafferty et al. 1993). These ~~are key~~ ions are associated with engine-lubricating oils, vehicular exhaust, and diesel fuel (Canagaratna et al., 2004). The HOA$_{\text{AMS}}$~~$_{\text{,org}}$ and HOA$_{\text{AMS,org+inorg}}$~~ factors contributed **38 ± 20%** ~~(of the OA$_{\text{AMS}}$)~~ and **21 ± 14%** ~~(~~of the OA$_{\text{AMS}}$ and ~~total~~ NR-PM$_1$~~)~~ mass, respectively (**Figures 6 and S14**).

~~HOA is generally associated with linked to vehicular emissions but from on-road traffic, it which were~~ The unconstrained PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ analysis was not able to apportion a road transport-related factor, ~~was not observed in the unconstrained PMF of PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$. H~~however, ~~an factor for on-road traffic factor was 'artificially' diagnosed in the PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ analysis~~ by constraining the ~~its~~ factorisation with the time series of a mobile gasoline factor, identified in the gas-phase PTR-ToF MS analyses of ALPACA campaign (Temime Roussel et al., 2022), a small road transport-associated factor was identified. ~~This approach was effective, revealing success of constraining this factor was evident in characteristics typical of on-road traffic. , such as~~ For instance, this latter ~~it~~ was strongly correlationed with black carbon and NO$_x$ (R^2 of 0.58 and 0.66; **Table 1**) and featured high contributions of C_8H_{10} (xylene; ethylbenzene~~; 2%~~), C_7H_8 (toluene~~; 4%~~), and C_6H_6 (benzene~~; 0.5%~~) ~~to its total mass concentrations~~ (**Figures 4 and S11**). Despite exhibiting some reasonable diurnal trend peaking at ~~In addition~~~~Notably, peaks in the daily average mass concentrations of the traffic$_{\text{CHARON}}$ factor coincided with~~ the morning (0900 AKST) and evening (1700–1600 AKST) rush hours (**Figure 5**),~~.~~ ~~However, the traffic$_{\text{CHARON}}$~~ the factor ~~had~~ accounted for negligible concentrations (< 1 μg/m^3) and presented some ~~it contained implausible~~unlikely species, such as *m/z* 315.22 ($C_{21}H_{30}O_2$; possibly cannabidiol) ~~that would otherwise (e.g., in~~absent in the unconstrained PMF. ~~trials) appear as PMF residuals,~~ ~~making its environmental representativeness suspicious.~~ ~~large discrepancy between the OA apportioned to HOA by PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ and AMS$_{\text{org}}$.~~ For instance, on average, **2.1 ± 3.0 μg/m^3** of OA was associated with HOA$_{\text{AMS,org}}$ ~~during the campaign~~, compared to only **0.1 ± 0.1 μg/m^3** for the road t~~raffic~~ransport$_{\text{CHARON}}$ factor (**Figure 6**). ~~We speculate that the~~ These discrepancies ~~shortcomings seen in OA mass measuredments by the from PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ relative compared to the AMS$_{\text{org}}$ were~~are largely instrumental, ~~particularly~~ partly due~~due~~ to ~~such as~~ the poor transmission ~~low sensitivities~~ of the ~~PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ for~~ small particles (<100 nm) by the CHARON inlet and the limited sensitivity towards hydrocarbons by PTR, but other possible biases can be due to heating oil OA signal interfering with the HOA$_{\text{AMS}}$, as discussed in **S8**. ~~Previous studies using the PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$ in Innsbruck, Austria, successfully observed a traffic factor, but did not detect no cooking emissions despite sampling operating at in an urban locality area (MüLler et al., 2017). A vVarietyous of environmental and user biases could also may be involved, such as the contribution of non-vehicular sources to the HOA$_{\text{AMS}}$ factors and the choiceuse of suboptimal conversion coefficients (e.g., RIE) in the AMS analyses (see **Sections S8** and **S9** for details). These are important considerations are critical for ambient air analysis in employing the with PTR$_{\text{CHARON}}$, as obtaining for ambient air analyses because a full picture of the sources involved, especially in urban regions influenced by~~

~~primary OA emissions of smaller particle sizes, may not be possible without necessitate complementary measurements.~~

3.2.4. Cooking organic aerosol

Another primary factor identified in Fairbanks was cooking, likely arising ~~which could either be~~ from residential or commercial activities around the CTC. ~~Both~~ The COA_{AMS} factor~~s~~ featured a high abundance of $C_xH_y^+$ ions, along with prominent O_1 fragments at *m/z* 55 ($C_3H_3O^+$), 84 ($C_5H_8O^+$), and 98 ($C_6H_{10}O^+$) ~~, which~~ originating~~e~~ from organic acids (Mohr et al., 2009) and ~~. These fragments have been reported serve~~ used as diagnostic ~~spectral~~ markers of COA in urban settings (Sun et al., 2011). The *f*55/*f*57 value (i.e., the ratio of fractions of $C_4H_7^+$ to $C_4H_9^+$) was ~3.00 for COA_{AMS}, compared to ~1.04 ~~in~~ for HOA_{AMS} (**Figure S10D**). ~~Although A a~~As a reliable tracer for COA remains unidentified in the AMS spectrum, a ~~high~~ *f*55/*f*57 ratio ~~of~~ >1 is considered a characteristic feature ~~of COA~~ (Katz et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2011) ~~because a reliable external tracer for it is yet to be identified~~. The PMF analysis of PTR_{CHARON} also ~~contained~~ revealed a distinct COA factor dominated by long-chain fatty acids, $C_{18}H_{32}O_2$, $C_{18}H_{34}O_2$, and $C_{18}H_{36}O_2$, identified ~~here~~ as linoleic, oleic, and stearic acids contributing to~~,~~ ~~that which contributed~~ 11, 16, and 4% to the total COA_{CHARON} mass (**Figure 4 and S11**). These fatty acids are commonly found ~~markers of~~ in OA from cooking oil and meat (Katz et al., 2021; Mohr et al., 2009). ~~Throughout Across the whole campaign,~~ The COA_{CHARON} ~~made peaked its highest contributions of at~~ contributed to a maximum of ~9% ~~to~~ of the total OA_{CHARON} mass and exhibited a unique diurnal pattern visualised in **Figure 5** with a minor maximum~~un~~ in the afternoon (lunchtime) and a second maximum in the evening (dinnertime). ~~, creating resulting in the a unique diurnal pattern visualised in **Figure 5**. Similarly to the HOA and traffic~~$_{CHARON}$ ~~factors~~The average~~verage~~ absolute concentrations of COA $_{AMS,org}$ ~~and COA~~$_{CHARON}$ ~~were quite disparate between the two instruments~~ were ~~(~~**0.6 ± 0.8** for the AMS and **0.1 ± 0.2 µg/m^3** for the CHARON, such a discrepancy can be explained by the same reason discussed above and detailed ~~), respectively for reason discussed above~~in the section ~~as well as in **Sections S8** and~~ **S9**. ~~**(Figure 6)**.~~

3.2.~~4~~5. Oxygenated organic aerosol

~~It is common in~~ P~~In the p~~ast source apportionment studies have reported ~~, it has been common to report~~ multiple OOA factors differing ~~that differ~~ in volatilities or oxygenation levels (e.g., Stefenelli et al., 2019a; Kumar et al., 2022; Cash et al., 2020). Here,~~,~~ ~~but~~ we diagnosed only a single OOA factor in either AMS or PTR_{CHARON} measurements. Specifically, t~~T~~he OOA_{AMS} factors ~~in AMS analyses was~~ were identified based on a prominent peak at *m/z* 43 ($C_2H_3O^+$) ~~which is a tracer of less oxygenated OA,~~ ~~—~~and *m/z* 29 (CHO^+; **Figure S10A**) and ~~. This factor It correlated~~ showed a strong correlation (R^2 0.74) with OOA$_{\text{CHARON}}$~~, with an R^2 of 0.74,~~ . The~~whe~~ average absolute concentrations of OOA$_{\text{CHARON}}$ and OOA$_{\text{AMS,org}}$ were **0.4 ± 0.6** and **1.0 ± 2.1 μg/m^3**, respectively.~~.~~ ~~–~~Notably, ts~~Some of t~~he most intense ions in the mass ~~spectra~~ spectrum of OOA$_{\text{CHARON}}$ ~~, relative to other factors,~~ have been tentatively assigned to~~included~~ *m/z* 73.03 ($C_3H_5O_2$, e.g., methylglyoxal), *m/z* 99.~~01~~ 04 (~~$C_4H_2O_3$~~$C_5H_6O_2$, e.g., ~~maleic anhydride~~oxo-pentanal), *m/z* 113.06 ($C_6H_8O_2$, e.g.,methyl-oxo-pentanal), *m/z* 127.08 ($C_7H_{10}O_2$; e.g., heptadienoic acid), *m/z* 137.06 ($C_8H_8O_2$; e.g., methoxy-benzaldehyde), *m/z* 167.10 ($C_{10}H_{14}O_2$), *m/z* 171.07 ($C_8H_{10}O_4$) and *m/z* 185.10 ($C_{13}H_{12}O$; e.g., benzyl phenol). Among these compounds some have previously been associated with atmospheric oxidation or photolysis of BBOA (Montoya-Aguilera et al., 2017; Lignell et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2020), other could be due to oxidation aromatic VOCs detected originating from road transport (Temime-Roussel et al., 2022). Few ~~Several, as well as some~~ other species ~~that~~ overlapped with the residential heating ~~factors~~tracers, notably *m/z* 163.06 ($C_6H_{10}O_5$; e.g., levoglucosan), *m/z* 179.08 ($C_{10}H_{10}O_3$; e.g., coniferaldehyde), and *m/z* 301.21 ($C_{20}H_{28}O_2$; e.g., dehydroabietic acid). ~~Some of these species compounds (e.g., $C_4H_2O_3$, $C_{10}H_{14}O_2$, $C_7H_{10}O_2$) have previously been associated with atmospheric oxidation or photolysis of BBOA (Montoya-Aguilera et al., 2017; Lignell et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2020).~~ But ~~G~~given the prominence of wood-burning as ~~the~~ a major primary emissions~~ in ALPACA~~, the OOA is likely linked to BBOA. A recent study in Fairbanks identified wintertime OOA as a mixture of BBOA and SOA formed from non-photochemical processing using an ACSM (Robinson et al., 2024). The examination of *f*44 versus *f*60 in the AMS$_{\text{org}}$ dataset plot (**Figure S10C**) is consistence with aged OOA derived by biomass burning, as previously demonstrated by Xu et al., (2023). Another recent source apportionment ~~of NR-PM$_1$~~study ~~measured~~ with the HR-ToF AMS at a site close to the CTC did not ~~reveal~~ identified an OOA factor~~ at all~~, while BBOA, HOA, and a mixed primary factor (HOA, COA, etc.) comprised 45, 25, and 31% of total OA~~, on average, during the campaign~~ (Yang et al., 2024). ~~Minimal processing, and thus, lL~~A limited OOA formation is plausible due to reduced ~~short~~ solar light exposure ~~periods and pollution residence~~ in this period of the year ~~in Fairbanks~~ (Cesler-Maloney et al., 2024), however,~~,~~ ~~but a~~ the ~~complete disappearance~~ absence of OOA is more likely a result ~~to be a consequence~~ of ~~it remaining~~ an unresolved organic fraction~~under the factorisation method used~~. ~~Another recent study in Fairbanks using the ACSM identified wintertime OOA as a mixture of real BBOA and SOA formed from non-photochemical processing (Robinson et al., 2024). This aspect was investigated via an *f*44 versus *f*60 plot for AMS$_{\text{org}}$ that supports some influence of biomass burning at all levels of oxidation of OA (**Figure S10C**). The placement of OOA$_{\text{AMS,org}}$ toward the left edge of the *f*44 versus *f*60 plot is consistent with aged OA from wood burning (Xu et al., 2023), but an urban influence cannot be ruled out in field settings (Cubison et al., 2011), especially when *m/z* 60 and 73 are only 0.2 and 0.4% of the total OOA$_{\text{AMS,org}}$ signal (**Figure S10B**).~~

Sulphate and OOA. ~~Much more~~ An intriguing insight ~~interesting information~~ about ~~regarding the~~the OOA factor emerged ~~was gleaned~~ from the AMS$_{\text{org+inorg}}$ measurements, ~~which revealed it to be rich~~

indicating a significant content of sulphur ~~in sulphur~~containing compounds (**Figure S15**). The AMS does not ~~quantitatively~~ distinguish among the different sulphur-containing species, but ~~such as hydroxymethane sulphonate (HMS; $CH_2(OH)SO^{-3}$), SO_3^{2-} (sulphite), HSO_3^{-} (bisulphite), and SO_4^{2-} (sulphate), or between organic and inorganic sulphur, but we have tried to use~~ following guidelines from previous works (Chen et al., 2019; Schueneman et al., 2021) we could explored ~~t~~the ratio of sulphur fragments to investigate ~~speculate on~~ the presence of different species ~~forms of sulphur present~~ such as hydroxymethane sulphonate (HMS; $CH_2(OH)SO^{-3}$), HSO_4^{-} (bisulphite), SO_4^{2-} (sulphate) and (H2SO4) sulphuric acid. ~~In light of previous studies on sulphur source apportionment with the AMS and source differentiation based on fragmentation patterns, (Chen et al., 2019; Schueneman et al., 2021).~~An organosulphate content of ~ **0.8 ± 1.3 $\mu g/m^3$** (~**20 ± 16%**) was then derived using the ratios of SO^+ and SO_2^+ ions against SO_3^+, HSO_3^+, and $H_2SO_4^+$ ions as detailed by Song et al., (2019). This value is in good agreement with previous reports from the same field campaign (Campbell et al., 2022; Robinson et al., 2024). Additionally, to mimic potential matrix effects of wood burning OA on sulphate fragmentation patterns, ~~we performed calibrations on the~~ AMS spectra from a solution of ~~with pure~~ $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ mixed with various amounts of levoglucosan (i.e., 0–80% in mass)~~. This mixture was used to assess the matrix effect that can potentially impact sulphur fragmentation patterns in an environment affected by wood smoke as previously demonstrated with other organic matrices. We~~ were compared to ambient data and PMF factors as shown ~~compared the fractions of HSO_3^+ to $H_2SO_4^+$ fragments normalised to the fractions $H_2SO_4^+$ and HSO_3^+ for pure $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ as suggested by Chen et al., (2019). Results are shown~~ in **Figure S16A**. ~~Results~~ Among the sulphate-rich factors the ~~are shown in **Figure S16A** where the~~ $OOA_{AMS,org+inorg}$ ~~factor~~ exhibited ~~much~~ lower HSO_3^+ to $H_2SO_4^+$ intensities suggesting ~~which is indicative of an influence of~~ an higher fraction of organosulphate ~~-~~compounds, as it is also evidenced in~~influence~~ **Figure S16D–E** by the strong correlation between derived organo~~-~~sulp~~a~~hur fraction and sulphate-ions in the $OOA_{AMS,org+inorg}$ factor (R^2 = 0.85, slope = 0.57)~~. (**Figure S16D–E**)~~. ~~The average total concentration of sulphursulphate-related fragments in $OOA_{AMS,org+inorg}$ was **0.9 ± 1.8 $\mu g/m^3$**, on average, and which accounted for **26 ± 23%** of the total sulphur sulphate measured with the AMS. This finding is consistent , which agrees with the theoretical estimations of organosulphur content (Song et al., 2019).~~

Further information on chemical composition was gathered by comparing ~~this factor~~AMS results with IC measurements from $PM_{0.7}$ filters sampled~~s~~ ~~analysed~~ as part of another ALPACA study (Dingilian et al., 2024). Despite the good correlations between the two datasets, shown in **Figure 7A,** the AMS results underestimated ~~-~~ ~~Although there is a notable underestimation Both methods (IC and AMS) correlated well, despite a negative bias against in the AMS analysis that underestimated the sums of approximately~~ by 30%, 26%, and 35% ~~lower sulphur~~sulphate, ammonium, and nitrate~~-related fragments~~, respectively (see **Section 2.2.2**~~ for fragments included~~). ~~the correlation between the two~~

~~methods remains strong by ~ 31, 26%, and 35% compared to the IC analyses (**Figure 7A**).~~ Both the total estimated organosulphur fraction and the OOA$_{AMS,org+inorg}$ factor presented ~~very strong~~robust correlations ($R^2 > 0.90$) with the S$_{(IV)}$ and HMS ions from filter analysis~~(**Figures 7B and S16F–I**)~~, and a somewhat ~~with a relatively~~ weaker ~~, but still strong~~ correlation ($R^2 > 0.61–0.68$)~~,~~ with the SO$_4^{2-}$ ion (**Figures 7 and S16F–I**). ~~In addition~~~~Additionally, the~~The OOA$_{AMS,org+inorg}$ ~~this~~ factor was also ~~very~~ strongly correlated with ~~total~~ ammonium (AMS data $R^2 = 0.86$~~95~~, **Table 1**; filter IC $R^2 = 0.77$, **Figure ~~S16D–E~~7B**), potentially promoting the formation of S$_{(IV)}$ species ~~under favourable meteorological conditions and aerosol composition~~ (Campbell et al., 2024). This author also reported that S$_{(IV)}$ species, including HMS, ~~have been~~ represented the ~~observed the~~ major secondary organosulphur component of PM$_{2.5}$ in Fairbanks during wintertime, ~~with average concentrations of 0.29 and 0.34 μg/m^3 recorded with IC in 2020 and 2021, respectively, and~~ contributing to 26–41% of total sulphate (Campbell et al., 2022). ~~Recently,co-varying HMS and S$_{(IV)}$ species, were distinguished in Fairbanks, and identifying the non-HMS S$_{(IV)}$ were reported to be as aldehyde-S$_{(IV)}$ compounds (Dingilian et al., 2024). In addition, this factor was very strongly correlated with total ammonium ($R^2 = 0.95$, **Table 1**; **Figure S16D–E**) which could raise aerosol pH, favouring the formation of S$_{(IV)}$ species under appropriate meteorological conditions and aerosol composition (Campbell et al., 2024). Therefore, the presence of HMS and other organic S$_{(IV)}$ species in the AMS$_{org+inorg}$ factor is well-substantiated.~~ Overall, the molecular level composition of OOA from PTR$_{CHARON}$ and the inorganic chemical information from AMS$_{org+inorg}$, as well as diurnal patters with ~~indicating~~ enhanced ~~peak~~ concentrations in the afternoon (**Figure 3**), are ~~that is~~ indicative of chemical daytime processing ~~that the wintertime OOA in Fairbanks is not solely comprised of HMS; . Instead, it is instead a complex mixture of secondary non-heteroatomic organic matter and organosulphur compounds, which~~ underscoring the need for further exploration of the ~~hints toward its formation from complex~~ atmospheric processing pathways involved~~that needs further exploration~~.

3.2.~~5~~6. Additional insights from combined analysis of organic and inorganic ~~in~~ AMS data ~~measurements~~

Two additional factors, sulph-OA (i.e., sulphur-rich OA) and AmNi (i.e., ammonium nitrate), were observed from the PMF of AMS$_{org+inorg}$ (**Figure 3**). Approximately 40–60% of these factors' masses comprised sulphur and nitrogen species (**Figure S15**).

Sulphur-rich organic aerosol: Sulph-OA is composed by sulphate 60%, organics 30%, ammonium 6% and nitrate 4%. ~~Like the OOA$_{AMS,org+inorg}$ factor, sulph-OA was also sulphur-rich. Its~~ The chemical composition was further explored via the fHSO$_3$/fH$_2$SO$_4$ analysis detailed in **Section 3.2.4** and as shown in ~~This factor lay in the upper-right quadrant of~~ **Figure S16A**, the factor is positioned between ~~pure~~

H_2SO_4 and~~and/or~~ $(NH_4)_2SO_4$. The measured [NH_4]/[SO_4] ratio ~~for sulph-OA~~ was 0.07, ~~which is much~~ considerably lower than the theoretical mass ratio of 0.38 and 0.18 ~~for~~ of $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ and NH_4HSO_4, respectively, indicating ~~. Therefore, this factor is inferred to have~~ an acidic nature of Sulph-OA (Chen et al. 2019). The ~~sulph-OA~~ factor was well ~~strongly~~ correlated with SO_2 ($R^2 = 0.6$)~~, which is majorly a primary product of residential heating oil (Dunleavy and Brune, 2020)~~ and moderately correlated with the ResH3 factor (R^2 of 0.33). The factor was also associated with ~~. Therefore, it is likely that sulph-OA comprises primary~~ ultrafine particles~~ emissions~~ in the 50–80 nm range ~~from heating oil combustion~~ (**Figure S12D**). ~~Surprisingly, sulph-OA was only moderately correlated with the ResH3 factor (R^2 of 0.33), which was identified as heating oil OA in the PTR_{CHARON} analysis.~~ Regardless of the low correlation, we speculate that ResH3 and sulph-OA ~~represent~~ originated from the same source, i.e., residential heating ~~fuel~~ oil combustion, and their temporal disagreement may result from instrumental biases of the CHARON inlet in quantifying particles smaller than 100 nm (**Figures S12B and D**). For instance, as shown in **Figures S12E–F**, the organic~~-only~~ ResH3 supersedes sulph-OA concentrations~~,~~ when larger particles are abundant, and it has lower concentrations for smaller particles.

This factor contained **0.6 ± 0.5 μg/m^3** ~~of sulphur. Despite the low concentrations, sulph-OA made up~~ (~**58 ± 26%**) of total ~~sulphur~~ sulphate measured with the AMS and ~~because~~ it dominated during the low-pollution periods, which were more frequent and lasted longer than the high-pollution ~~periods~~ events (**Figure 1**). Other primary factors, $HOA_{AMS,org+inorg}$, $COA_{AMS,org+inorg}$, and $BBOA_{AMS,org+inorg}$, contained an additional 11 ± 9% of the ~~sulphur~~ sulphate (**0.2 ± 0.2 μg/m^3**), so collectively, ~~. P~~primary ~~sulphur~~ factors ~~collectively~~ made up **69 ± 24%** (**0.7 ± 0.6 μg/m^3**) of total ~~sulphur~~sulphate. This value is in close agreement with a previous ALPACA study that reported ~62 ± 12% of total SO_4^{2-} mass to be of primary origin ~~and associated with particles of smaller than 700 nm (2.1 ± 1.4 μg/m^3 in $PM_{0.7}$)~~ (Moon et al., 2023).

AmNi factor ~~***includes atmospherically processed vehicular emissions***~~.~~:~~ The second inorganic factor was composed of 35% nitrate~~s~~, 14% ammonium, and 43% organics ~~. It accounted~~ accounting for 71 ± 23% of the total nitrate measured by the AMS ~~in NR-PM1~~ (R^2 = 0.98). The average concentration~~s~~ of this factor and the nitrate species in it were **1.1 ± 1.6** μg/m^3 and **0.4 ± 0.5** μg/m^3. The factor was more abundant when NOx concentrations were high (above 130 ppbv)(**Figure S17B**), its diurnal trend peaked around 1400 **AKST** (Figure 3), roughly 3-4 hours after the morning peak of HOA_{AMS} and was associated with relatively small particles of 110 nm (**Figure S12D**). A high contribution of aliphatic moieties characterised the organic fraction, and according to the difference in mass concentrations of $HOA_{AMS,org}$ and $HOA_{AMS,org+inorg}$ of 13% (**Figure S17A**), we speculate that some organic components of $HOA_{AMS,org}$

were transferred to the AmNi factor (**Figure 6**). All these elements suggest a probable contribution from the vehicular emissions to this factor. The presence of inorganic compounds provided more variables to the PMF, and thus, improved the resolution of factors into distinct AmNi and HOA$_{AMS,org+inorg}$ factors. ~~It presented a distinct peak from ~1200–1800 hrs and then stable, low concentrations throughout the night (Figure 3). This peak followed 3–4 hours after the peak in the mass concentrations of HOAAMS (or trafficCHARON) during the morning, implying its probable origin from vehicular NOx, which was supported by the highest contributions of this factor coinciding with peaks in NOx concentrations (Figure S17B). Generally, during the ALPACA campaign, the AmNi factor had much lower concentrations than HOAAMS,org+inorg; however, they were both associated with the highest recorded ambient temperatures (5 to -10°C) and solar radiations (as per jNO2 values)(Figure S17C–D). According to atmospheric modelling studies in Fairbanks (Joyce et al., 2014), the formation of NO3 from NOx via the nocturnal reactions slows at temperatures below -15°C, causing them to have higher concentrations during warmer periods. Interestingly, according to the difference in mass concentrations of HOAAMS,org and HOAAMS,org+inorg and its correlation with the AmNi factor (Figure S17A), we speculate that some portion of the organic components of of the AmNi factor were apportioned to HOAAMS,org causing it to have higher contributions than HOAAMS,org+inorg (Figure 6). The inclusion of inorganics provided more variables to the PMF, and thus, improved the resolution of factors into distinct AmNi and HOAAMS,org+inorg factors.~~

4. Local environmental implications ~~and conclusive remarks~~

~~For instance~~During the period of the campaign, ~~during this study,~~ 12–48-hour-long ADEC advisories for wood-burning restrictions were implemented seven times. Variation in the relative contributions of ResH1–4 during these advisories is depicted in **Figures 8** and **S18–21**. For all advisory events, ResH2 and ResH4, i.e., woodsmoke, were the predominant contributors *before* and *after* the advisories were in place. ~~ResH2 (i.e., hardwood-related fuels) remained a prominent contributor to OA$_{CHARON}$ *during* the 3rd (Stage 2), 4th (Stage 1), and 5th (Stage 1) advisories.~~ A notable increase was observed in ResH3 contribution, i.e., heating oil, ~~at least once~~ *during* the 2nd (Stage 1), 5th (Stage 1), 6th (Stage 1), and 7th advisory events. While ~~.~~ ResH2 (i.e., hardwood-related fuels) remained a prominent contributor to OA$_{CHARON}$ *during* the 3rd (Stage 2), 4th (Stage 1), and 5th (Stage 1) advisories. Most households in Fairbanks use heating oil (~72% of residents), followed by wood (~22% of residents) (Dunleavy and Brune, 2019), which was not reflected ~~here~~ in the relative contributions ~~of~~ apportioned to ResH3. ~~-~~This can be linked to a higher PM$_1$ release from wood combustion per given volume of fuel compared to ~~other commonly used sources, including~~ heating oil and/or an ~~especially under less-than-optimal combustion conditions (e.g., moist wood) or with inefficient appliances. There is also the possibility~~

~~that due to the typical particle size of ResH3 emissions~~underestimation of ResH3 by PTR$_{CHARON}$ being associated with smaller than 100 nm (**Figure S12**).

~~All seven ADEC advisories coincided with the coldest periods of the campaign (**Figure 1**). Therefore, the response of Fairbanks' residents to ADEC advisories cannot be assessed independently from their response to increased need for heating or the dynamics of OA under the unique meteorology (i.e., low temperatures/low solar radiations/strong inversions) during sampling. In our study~~As expected, the absolute average concentrations of all factors were inversely related to ambient temperature, but the percent change differed considerably across factors. Specifically, as temperatures decreased from -10°C to below -25°C, the average absolute concentrations for ~~traffic~~transport$_{CHARON}$, COA$_{CHARON}$, OOA$_{CHARON}$, ResH1–4 increased 0.25×, 0.75×, 9.0×, 1.4×, 25.1×, 3.0×, and 2.9×, respectively (**Figure S22**). The steep increase in the relative contribution of ResH2~~, was~~ associated with hardwood-tracers, contrasts with previous reports~~based fuels. In contrast~~, based on surveys (Dunleavy and Brune, 2019) and ~~ratios of~~ organic tracers ~~in ambient air samples~~ (Haque et al., 2021), ~~previous studies reported~~ indicating birch and spruce ~~whichare widely found in Alaskan boreal forests,~~ as the most popular firewood in Fairbanks. Laboratory studies have shown that the burning of softwood pellets of Douglas Fir or eastern white pine emits less PM than hardwood pellets of the same volume, and this response varies based on the moisture content of the wood and the heating appliance used (Morin et al., 2022). ~~High PM emission per volume burned could also be the reason behind hardwood burning being the dominant contributor of PM in our analysis.~~ Also ResH2 comprises a broader spectrum of volatile and semi-volatile substituted phenolic species, and thus, it is likely to undergo efficient gas-to-particle partitioning at low temperatures toward increasing OA loads (Ijaz et al., 2025). ~~Overall, investigating the variation in the emission patterns, especially in response to regulations, such as the ADEC burn restrictions, is a complex issue that requires appropriately acknowledging the influence of meteorology, the physicochemical nature of the emissions, and change in emissions at the source. Based on the observations in this study, it cannot be conclusively inferred that either hardwood- or softwood-based solid fuels are more popularly consumed wood types in Fairbanks, but they are certainly among the largest contributors to sub-micron OA emissions. These findings are critical to addressing air pollution in Fairbanks, which has been a persistent issue for a long time, by guiding policies and citizen action~~

5. Conclusion

A CHARON inlet coupled with PTR-ToF MS and HE-ToF-AMS were deployed during the Alaskan Layered Pollution and Chemical Analysis (ALPACA) campaign. The PMF analysis of AMS data revealed three primary factors: biomass burning, hydrocarbon-like and cooking factors accounting for

28, 38 and 11 % of the total OA, respectively. A combined organic and inorganic PMF analysis provided additional insights and revealed the presence of an organo-sulphate compounds mostly associated to the OOA factor and of another sulphate-rich factor of acidic nature. A nitrate factor, associated with hydrocarbon-like OA and high NOx levels, was interpreted as aged road transport emissions. The PTR_{CHARON} PMF analysis could differentiate four residential heating sources—one oil combustion and three wood combustion types, associated with low temperature, softwood, and hardwood combustion. Such factorisation was achieved with the support of specific tracers that CHARON could successfully identify, as furans, aromatic alcohols (resorcinol, guaiacol, eugenol, syringiol), aldehydes (furfural, coniferaldehyde), acids (benzoic, dehydroabietic, abietic, linoleic, oleic, and stearic) and various PAHs. Collectively all residential heating factors accounting for 79% of the total OA_{CHARON}. Cooking and road transport were also recognised as primary sources by PTR_{CHARON}. All PMF analyses could apportion a single secondary organic fraction accounting for 11-19% of the total OA. This work evidence the complementarity of the two instruments and their ability in describing the complex chemical composition of PM_1 and the related sources. The enhanced deconvolution of closely co-varying sources of ambient pollution epitomises the novelty of our study and demonstrates the capability of PTR_{CHARON} to deliver detailed qualitative and quantitative insights, thus enabling a comprehensive understanding of organic aerosol sources. These advances can assist environmental regulators and citizen efforts to improve air quality in Fairbanks and the fast-urbanising regional sub-Arctic areas.

Data availability

Supporting text, figures, and tables are available in the Supplementary Material.

Author contributions

The manuscript was written with the contributions of all authors. BT-R and BDA set up, ran, and maintained the instrumentation during the campaign in Fairbanks. SA, NB, and ED aided during the campaign. MC-S collected and contributed meteorological and trace gas data. BA, RJW, KD, and AM provided data on ion chromatography analysis of offline filter samples. BT-R and AI processed and analysed the data with help from BC. WS and KS coordinated the ALPACA and CASPA projects. KL, BDA, BB, SB, JF, JM, and JS contributed to funding acquisition for the CASPA project. BDA supervised the project reported here.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We thank the ALPACA team of researchers and all others involved in designing the project and providing the necessary logistical support to carry it out. We thank Dr Anna Tobler (Datalystica Ltd, Switzerland) for providing technical support for SoFi analysis. This work was funded by the CASPA (Climate-relevant Aerosol Sources and Processes in the Arctic) project of the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (grant no. ANR-21-CE01-0017) and the IPEV (French Polar Institute Paul-Émile Victor). KD and RJW were supported by the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Atmospheric Geoscience Program (grant no. AGS-2029730) and the NSF Navigating the New Arctic Program (grant no. NNA-1927778). SRA acknowledges support from the UK Natural Environment Research Council (grant ref: NE/W00609X/1). We thank the MASSALYA instrumental platform (Aix-Marseille Université, Laboratory of Chemistry and Environment, lce.univ-amu.fr) for the measurements used in this publication. AI is grateful to Subuktageen Qitta, Nastaran Mahmud, Laal Boo'on-Wali, and Minuit Mahmud for the many useful discussions that helped compile this report.

References

Aiken, A. C., DeCarlo, P. F., and Jimenez, J. L.: Elemental analysis of organic species with electron ionization high-resolution mass spectrometry, Analytical chemistry, 79, 8350-8358, 2007.

Aiken, A. C., Decarlo, P. F., Kroll, J. H., Worsnop, D. R., Huffman, J. A., Docherty, K. S., Ulbrich, I. M., Mohr, C., Kimmel, J. R., and Sueper, D.: O/C and OM/OC ratios of primary, secondary, and ambient organic aerosols with high-resolution time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometry, Environmental science & technology, 42, 4478-4485, 2008.

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Know Your Wood: https://dec.alaska.gov/air/burnwise/know-your-wood

Alves, C. A., Vicente, E. D., Rocha, S., and Vicente, A. M.: Organic tracers in aerosols from the residential combustion of pellets and agro-fuels, Air Quality, Atmosphere & Health, 10, 37-45, 2017.

Bari, M. A., Baumbach, G., Kuch, B., and Scheffknecht, G.: Wood smoke as a source of particle-phase organic compounds in residential areas, Atmospheric Environment, 43, 4722–4732, 2009.

Brégonzio-Rozier, L., Siekmann, F., Giorio, C., Pangui, E., Morales, S., Temime-Roussel, B., Gratien, A., Michoud, V., Ravier, S., and Cazaunau, M.: Gaseous products and secondary organic aerosol formation during long term oxidation of isoprene and methacrolein, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 15, 2953-2968, 2015.

Campbell, J. R., Battaglia Jr, M., Dingilian, K., Cesler-Maloney, M., St Clair, J. M., Hanisco, T. F., Robinson, E., DeCarlo, P., Simpson, W., and Nenes, A.: Source and Chemistry of Hydroxymethanesulfonate (HMS) in Fairbanks, Alaska, Environmental Science & Technology, 2022.

Campbell, J. R., Battaglia Jr, M., Dingilian, K. K., Cesler-Maloney, M., Simpson, W. R., Robinson, E. S., DeCarlo, P. F., Temime-Roussel, B., D'Anna, B., and Holen, A. L.: Enhanced aqueous formation and neutralization of fine atmospheric particles driven by extreme cold, Science Advances, 10, eado4373, 2024.

Canagaratna, M., Jayne, J., Jimenez, J., Allan, J., Alfarra, M., Zhang, Q., Onasch, T., Drewnick, F., Coe, H., and Middlebrook, A.: Chemical and microphysical characterization of ambient aerosols with the aerodyne aerosol mass spectrometer, Mass spectrometry reviews, 26, 185-222, 2007.

Canagaratna, M., Jimenez, J., Kroll, J., Chen, Q., Kessler, S., Massoli, P., Hildebrandt Ruiz, L., Fortner, E., Williams, L., and Wilson, K.: Elemental ratio measurements of organic compounds using aerosol mass spectrometry: characterization, improved calibration, and implications, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 15, 253-272, 2015.

Canagaratna, M. R., Jayne, J. T., Ghertner, D. A., Herndon, S., Shi, Q., Jimenez, J. L., Silva, P. J., Williams, P., Lanni, T., and Drewnick, F.: Chase studies of particulate emissions from in-use New York City vehicles, Aerosol Science and Technology, 38, 555-573, 2004.

Canonaco, F., Crippa, M., Slowik, J. G., Baltensperger, U., and Prévôt, A. S.: SoFi, an IGOR-based interface for the efficient use of the generalized multilinear engine (ME-2) for the source apportionment: ME-2 application to aerosol mass spectrometer data, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 6, 3649-3661, 2013.

Cash, J. M., Langford, B., Di Marco, C., Mullinger, N., Allan, J., Reyes-Villegas, E., Joshi, R., Heal, M. R., Acton, W. J. F., and Hewitt, N.: Seasonal analysis of submicron aerosol in Old Delhi using high resolution aerosol mass spectrometry: Chemical characterisation, source apportionment and new marker identification, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, 2020, 1-42, 2020.

Cesler-Maloney, M., Simpson, W., Kuhn, J., Stutz, J., Thomas, J., Roberts, T., Huff, D., and Cooperdock, S.: Shallow boundary layer heights controlled by the surface-based temperature inversion strength are responsible for trapping home heating emissions near the ground level in Fairbanks, Alaska, EGUsphere, 2024, 1-51, 2024.

Cesler-Maloney, M., Simpson, W. R., Miles, T., Mao, J., Law, K. S., and Roberts, T. J.: Differences in Ozone and Particulate Matter Between Ground Level and 20 m Aloft are Frequent During Wintertime Surface-Based Temperature Inversions in Fairbanks, Alaska, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 127, e2021JD036215, 2022.

Chazeau, B., El Haddad, I., Canonaco, F., Temime-Roussel, B., d'Anna, B., Gille, G., Mesbah, B., Prévôt, A. S., Wortham, H., and Marchand, N.: Organic aerosol source apportionment by using rolling positive matrix factorization: Application to a Mediterranean coastal city, Atmospheric environment: X, 14, 100176, 2022.

Chen, G., Canonaco, F., Tobler, A., Aas, W., Alastuey, A., Allan, J., Atabakhsh, S., Aurela, M., Baltensperger, U., and Bougiatioti, A.: European aerosol phenomenology− 8: Harmonised source apportionment of organic aerosol using 22 Year-long ACSM/AMS datasets, Environment international, 166, 107325, 2022.

Chen, G., Li, S., Zhang, Y., Zhang, W., Li, D., Wei, X., He, Y., Bell, M. L., Williams, G., and Marks, G. B.: Effects of ambient PM1 air pollution on daily emergency hospital visits in China: an epidemiological study, The Lancet Planetary Health, 1, e221-e229, 2017.

Chen, Y., Xu, L., Humphry, T., Hettiyadura, A. P., Ovadnevaite, J., Huang, S., Poulain, L., Schroder, J. C., Campuzano-Jost, P., and Jimenez, J. L.: Response of the aerodyne aerosol mass spectrometer to inorganic sulfates and organosulfur compounds: Applications in field and laboratory measurements, Environmental science & technology, 53, 5176-5186, 2019.

Collard, F.-X. and Blin, J.: A review on pyrolysis of biomass constituents: Mechanisms and composition of the products obtained from the conversion of cellulose, hemicelluloses and lignin, Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev., 38, 594–608, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.06.013, 2014.

Crippa, M., Canonaco, F., Lanz, V., Äijälä, M., Allan, J., Carbone, S., Capes, G., Ceburnis, D., Dall'Osto, M., and Day, D.: Organic aerosol components derived from 25 AMS data sets across Europe using a consistent ME-2 based source apportionment approach, Atmospheric chemistry and physics, 14, 6159-6176, 2014.

Cubison, M., Ortega, A., Hayes, P., Farmer, D., Day, D., Lechner, M., Brune, W., Apel, E., Diskin, G., and Fisher, J.: Effects of aging on organic aerosol from open biomass burning smoke in aircraft and laboratory studies, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 12049-12064, 2011.

Czarnecki, N.: Local Air Quality Regulations: How to Participate and Comply, Clear the Air Home Heating Forum and Expo,

DeCarlo, P. F., Kimmel, J. R., Trimborn, A., Northway, M. J., Jayne, J. T., Aiken, A. C., Gonin, M., Fuhrer, K., Horvath, T., and Docherty, K. S.: Field-deployable, high-resolution, time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer, Analytical chemistry, 78, 8281-8289, 2006.

Dingilian, K., Hebert, E., Battaglia Jr, M., Campbell, J. R., Cesler-Maloney, M., Simpson, W., St. Clair, J. M., Dibb, J., Temime-Roussel, B., and D'anna, B.: Hydroxymethanesulfonate and Sulfur (IV) in Fairbanks Winter During the ALPACA Study, ACS ES&T Air, 2024.

Dunleavy, M. and Brune, J. W.: Amendments to: State Air Quality Control Plan. Vol. III: Appendix III.D.7.06, 2019.

Dunleavy, M. J. and Brune, J. W.: Amendments to State Air Quality Control Plan: Vol. III: Appendix III.D.7.7, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, 2020.

Eichler, P., Müller, M., D'anna, B., and Wisthaler, A.: A novel inlet system for online chemical analysis of semi-volatile submicron particulate matter, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 8, 1353-1360, 2015.

Eichler, P., Müller, M., Rohmann, C., Stengel, B., Orasche, J. r., Zimmermann, R., and Wisthaler, A.: Lubricating oil as a major constituent of ship exhaust particles, Environmental Science & Technology Letters, 4, 54-58, 2017.

Ellis, A. and Mayhew, C.: Chemical Ionization: Chemistry, Thermodynamics and Kinetics, Proton Transfer Reaction Mass Spectrometry, 25-48, 2014.

Fairbanks Air Quality Plan: https://www.epa.gov/ak/fairbanks-air-quality-plan, last access: May 07, 2024.

Fine, P. M., Cass, G. R., and Simoneit, B. R.: Chemical characterization of fine particle emissions from fireplace combustion of woods grown in the northeastern United States, Environmental Science & Technology, 35, 2665-2675, 2001.

Fine, P. M., Cass, G. R., and Simoneit, B. R.: Organic compounds in biomass smoke from residential wood combustion: Emissions characterization at a continental scale, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 107, ICC 11-11-ICC 11-19, 2002.

Fraser, M. P. and Lakshmanan, K.: Using levoglucosan as a molecular marker for the long-range transport of biomass combustion aerosols, Environmental Science & Technology, 34, 4560-4564, 2000.

Fye, M., Havel, B., Havel, H., and Putnam, J.: Opportunities for Air Quality Improvement in the Fairbanks North Star Borough, 2009.

Gkatzelis, G. I., Hohaus, T., Tillmann, R., Gensch, I., Müller, M., Eichler, P., Xu, K.-M., Schlag, P., Schmitt, S. H., and Yu, Z.: Gas-to-particle partitioning of major biogenic oxidation products: a study on freshly formed and aged biogenic SOA, Atmospheric chemistry and physics, 18, 12969-12989, 2018.

Glasius, M., Ketzel, M., Wåhlin, P., Jensen, B., Mønster, J., Berkowicz, R., and Palmgren, F.: Impact of wood combustion on particle levels in a residential area in Denmark, Atmospheric Environment, 40, 7115-7124, 2006.

Gueneron, M., Erickson, M. H., VanderSchelden, G. S., and Jobson, B. T.: PTR-MS fragmentation patterns of gasoline hydrocarbons, International Journal of Mass Spectrometry, 379, 97-109, 2015.

Guo, S., Hu, M., Peng, J., Wu, Z., Zamora, M. L., Shang, D., Du, Z., Zheng, J., Fang, X., and Tang, R.: Remarkable nucleation and growth of ultrafine particles from vehicular exhaust, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117, 3427-3432, 2020.

Haque, M. M., Kawamura, K., Deshmukh, D. K., Kunwar, B., and Kim, Y.: Biomass burning is an important source of organic aerosols in interior Alaska, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 126, e2021JD034586, 2021.

Herring, C. L., Faiola, C. L., Massoli, P., Sueper, D., Erickson, M. H., McDonald, J. D., Simpson, C. D., Yost, M. G., Jobson, B. T., and VanReken, T. M.: New methodology for quantifying polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) using high-resolution aerosol mass spectrometry, Aerosol Science and Technology, 49, 1131-1148, 2015.

Ijaz, A., Temime Roussel, B., Kammer, J., Mao, J., Simpson, W., Law, K., and D'Anna, B.: In situ measurements of gas-particle partitioning of organic compounds in Fairbanks, Faraday Discussions - In Prep, 2025.

Janhäll, S., Andreae, M. O., and Pöschl, U.: Biomass burning aerosol emissions from vegetation fires: particle number and mass emission factors and size distributions, Atmospheric chemistry and physics, 10, 1427-1439, 2010.

Jentgen, M.: Technical support document for Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation’s (ADEC) control measure analysis, under 40 CFR 1010(a) and (c), US EPA, Region 10, Air and Radiation Division, 2022.

Jiang, X., Tsona, N. T., Jia, L., Liu, S., Zhang, H., Xu, Y., and Du, L.: Secondary organic aerosol formation from photooxidation of furan: effects of NO x and humidity, Atmospheric chemistry and physics, 19, 13591-13609, 2019.

Joyce, P., Von Glasow, R., and Simpson, W.: The fate of NO x emissions due to nocturnal oxidation at high latitudes: 1-D simulations and sensitivity experiments, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14, 7601-7616, 2014.

Katz, E. F., Guo, H., Campuzano-Jost, P., Day, D. A., Brown, W. L., Boedicker, E., Pothier, M., Lunderberg, D. M., Patel, S., and Patel, K.: Quantification of cooking organic aerosol in the indoor environment using aerodyne aerosol mass spectrometers, Aerosol Science and Technology, 55, 1099-1114, 2021.

Kawamoto, H.: Lignin pyrolysis reactions, Journal of Wood Science, 63, 117-132, 2017.

Kong, X., Salvador, C. M., Carlsson, S., Pathak, R., Davidsson, K. O., Le Breton, M., Gaita, S. M., Mitra, K., Hallquist, Å. M., and Hallquist, M.: Molecular characterization and optical properties of primary emissions from a residential wood burning boiler, Science of the Total Environment, 754, 142143, 2021.

Koss, A. R., Sekimoto, K., Gilman, J. B., Selimovic, V., Coggon, M. M., Zarzana, K. J., Yuan, B., Lerner, B. M., Brown, S. S., Jimenez, J. L., Krechmer, J., Roberts, J. M., Warneke, C., Yokelson, R. J., and De Gouw, J.: Non-methane organic gas emissions from biomass burning: identification, quantification, and emission factors from PTR-ToF during the FIREX 2016 laboratory experiment, Atmospheric Chem. Phys., 18, 3299–3319, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-3299-2018, 2018.

Kostenidou, E., Marques, B., Temime-Roussel, B., Liu, Y., Vansevenant, B., Sartelet, K., and D'Anna, B.: Secondary organic aerosol formed by Euro 5 gasoline vehicle emissions: chemical composition and gas-to-particle phase partitioning, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 24, 2705-2729, 2024.

Kostenidou, E., Martinez-Valiente, A., R'Mili, B., Marques, B., Temime-Roussel, B., André, M., Liu, Y., Louis, C., Vansevenant, B., and Ferry, D.: Emission factors, chemical composition and morphology of particles emitted from Euro 5 diesel and gasoline light duty vehicles during transient cycles, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, 2020, 1-33, 2020.

Kotchenruther, R. A.: Source apportionment of PM2. 5 at multiple Northwest US sites: Assessing regional winter wood smoke impacts from residential wood combustion, Atmospheric Environment, 142, 210-219, 2016.

Kumar, V., Giannoukos, S., Haslett, S. L., Tong, Y., Singh, A., Bertrand, A., Lee, C. P., Wang, D. S., Bhattu, D., and Stefenelli, G.: Highly time-resolved chemical speciation and source apportionment of organic aerosol components in Delhi, India, using extractive electrospray ionization mass spectrometry, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 22, 7739-7761, 2022.

Lannuque, V., d'Anna, B., Kostenidou, E., Couvidat, F., Martinez-Valiente, A., Eichler, P., Wisthaler, A., Müller, M., Temime-Roussel, B., and Valorso, R.: Gas–particle partitioning of toluene oxidation products: an experimental and modeling study, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 23, 15537-15560, 2023.

Leglise, J., Müller, M., Piel, F., Otto, T., and Wisthaler, A.: Bulk Organic Aerosol Analysis by Proton-Transfer-Reaction Mass Spectrometry: An Improved Methodology for the Determination of Total Organic Mass, O: C and H: C Elemental Ratios, and the Average Molecular Formula, Analytical chemistry, 91, 12619-12624, 2019.

Lignell, H., Epstein, S. A., Marvin, M. R., Shemesh, D., Gerber, B., and Nizkorodov, S.: Experimental and theoretical study of aqueous cis-pinonic acid photolysis, The Journal of Physical Chemistry A, 117, 12930-12945, 2013.

Liu, L., Breitner, S., Schneider, A., Cyrys, J., Brüske, I., Franck, U., Schlink, U., Leitte, A. M., Herbarth, O., and Wiedensohler, A.: Size-fractioned particulate air pollution and cardiovascular emergency room visits in Beijing, China, Environmental research, 121, 52-63, 2013.

Lopez-Hilfiker, F., Mohr, C., Ehn, M., Rubach, F., Kleist, E., Wildt, J., Mentel, T. F., Lutz, A., Hallquist, M., and Worsnop, D.: A novel method for online analysis of gas and particle composition: description and evaluation of a Filter Inlet for Gases and AEROsols (FIGAERO), Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 7, 983-1001, 2014.

Louis, C., Liu, Y., Martinet, S., D'Anna, B., Valiente, A. M., Boreave, A., R'Mili, B., Tassel, P., Perret, P., and Andre, M.: Dilution effects on ultrafine particle emissions from Euro 5 and Euro 6 diesel and gasoline vehicles, Atmospheric environment, 169, 80-88, 2017.

Mainka, A. and Zajusz-Zubek, E.: PM1 in ambient and indoor air—urban and rural areas in the Upper Silesian Region, Poland, Atmosphere, 10, 662, 2019.

Mayfield, J. A. and Fochesatto, G. J.: The layered structure of the winter atmospheric boundary layer in the interior of Alaska, Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 52, 953-973, 2013.

McLafferty, F. W. and Tureˇcek, F.: Interpretation of mass spectra, Mill Valley (Calif.) : University Science Books, 4th ed. edn., ISBN 0935702253, 1993.

Meng, X., Ma, Y., Chen, R., Zhou, Z., Chen, B., and Kan, H.: Size-fractionated particle number concentrations and daily mortality in a Chinese city, Environmental health perspectives, 121, 1174-1178, 2013.

Middlebrook, A. M., Bahreini, R., Jimenez, J. L., and Canagaratna, M. R.: Evaluation of composition-dependent collection efficiencies for the aerodyne aerosol mass spectrometer using field data, Aerosol Science and Technology, 46, 258-271, 2012.

Mohr, C., Huffman, J. A., Cubison, M. J., Aiken, A. C., Docherty, K. S., Kimmel, J. R., Ulbrich, I. M., Hannigan, M., and Jimenez, J. L.: Characterization of primary organic aerosol emissions from meat cooking, trash burning, and motor vehicles with high-resolution aerosol mass spectrometry and comparison with ambient and chamber observations, Environmental Science & Technology, 43, 2443-2449, 2009.

Montoya-Aguilera, J., Horne, J. R., Hinks, M. L., Fleming, L. T., Perraud, V., Lin, P., Laskin, A., Laskin, J., Dabdub, D., and Nizkorodov, S. A.: Secondary organic aerosol from atmospheric photooxidation of indole, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 17, 11605-11621, 2017.

Moon, A., Jongebloed, U., Dingilian, K. K., Schauer, A. J., Chan, Y.-C., Cesler-Maloney, M., Simpson, W. R., Weber, R. J., Tsiang, L., and Yazbeck, F.: Primary Sulfate Is the Dominant Source of Particulate Sulfate during Winter in Fairbanks, Alaska, ACS ES&T Air, 2023.

Morin, B., Allen, G., Marin, A., Rector, L., and Ahmadi, M.: Impacts of wood species and moisture content on emissions from residential wood heaters, Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 72, 647-661, 2022.

Müller, M., Leglise, J., Piel, F., and Wisthaler, A.: A CHARON PTR-ToF-MS study on the volatility of freshly formed biogenic SOA, Geophysical Research Abstracts,

Müller, M., Eichler, P., D’Anna, B., Tan, W., and Wisthaler, A.: Direct sampling and analysis of atmospheric particulate organic matter by proton-transfer-reaction mass spectrometry, Analytical chemistry, 89, 10889-10897, 2017.

Paatero, P.: Least squares formulation of robust non-negative factor analysis, Chemometrics and intelligent laboratory systems, 37, 23-35, 1997a.

Paatero, P.: A weighted non-negative least squares algorithm for three-way ‘PARAFAC’factor analysis, Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems, 38, 223-242, 1997b.

Paatero, P.: The multilinear engine—a table-driven, least squares program for solving multilinear problems, including the n-way parallel factor analysis model, Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 8, 854-888, 1999.

Paatero, P. and Hopke, P. K.: Discarding or downweighting high-noise variables in factor analytic models, Analytica Chimica Acta, 490, 277-289, 2003.

Paatero, P. and Tapper, U.: Positive matrix factorization: A non-negative factor model with optimal utilization of error estimates of data values, Environmetrics, 5, 111-126, 1994.

Paatero, P., Eberly, S., Brown, S., and Norris, G.: Methods for estimating uncertainty in factor analytic solutions, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 7, 781-797, 2014.

Palm, B. B., Peng, Q., Fredrickson, C. D., Lee, B. H., Garofalo, L. A., Pothier, M. A., Kreidenweis, S. M., Farmer, D. K., Pokhrel, R. P., and Shen, Y.: Quantification of organic aerosol and brown carbon evolution in fresh wildfire plumes, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117, 29469-29477, 2020.

Peng, Y., Wang, H., Gao, Y., Jing, S., Zhu, S., Huang, D., Hao, P., Lou, S., Cheng, T., and Huang, C.: Real-time measurement of phase partitioning of organic compounds using a proton-transfer-reaction time-of-flight mass spectrometer coupled to a CHARON inlet, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 16, 15-28, 2023.

Piel, F., Müller, M., Mikoviny, T., Pusede, S. E., and Wisthaler, A.: Airborne measurements of particulate organic matter by proton-transfer-reaction mass spectrometry (PTR-MS): a pilot study, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 12, 5947-5958, 2019.

Piel, F., Müller, M., Winkler, K., Skytte af Sätra, J., and Wisthaler, A.: Introducing the extended volatility range proton-transfer-reaction mass spectrometer (EVR PTR-MS), Atmospheric Meas. Tech., 14, 1355–1363, 2021.

Pikridas, M., Sciare, J., Freutel, F., Crumeyrolle, S., Von Der Weiden-Reinmüller, S., Borbon, A., Schwarzenboeck, A., Merkel, M., Crippa, M., and Kostenidou, E.: In situ formation and spatial variability of particle number concentration in a European megacity, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 15, 10219-10237, 2015.

Qi, L., Chen, M., Stefenelli, G., Pospisilova, V., Tong, Y., Bertrand, A., Hueglin, C., Ge, X., Baltensperger, U., and Prévôt, A. S.: Organic aerosol source apportionment in Zurich using an extractive electrospray ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometer (EESI-TOF-MS)–Part 2: Biomass burning influences in winter, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 19, 8037-8062, 2019.

Reemtsma, T.: Determination of molecular formulas of natural organic matter molecules by (ultra-) high-resolution mass spectrometry: status and needs, Journal of chromatography A, 1216, 3687-3701, 2009.

Reid, J., Koppmann, R., Eck, T., and Eleuterio, D.: A review of biomass burning emissions part II: intensive physical properties of biomass burning particles, Atmospheric chemistry and physics, 5, 799-825, 2005.

Robinson, E. S., Cesler-Maloney, M., Tan, X., Mao, J., Simpson, W., and DeCarlo, P. F.: Wintertime spatial patterns of particulate matter in Fairbanks, AK during ALPACA 2022, Environmental Science: Atmospheres, 3, 568-580, 2023.

Robinson, E. S., Battaglia Jr, M., Campbell, J. R., Cesler-Maloney, M., Simpson, W., Mao, J., Weber, R. J., and DeCarlo, P. F.: Multi-year, high-time resolution aerosol chemical composition and mass measurements from Fairbanks, Alaska, Environmental Science: Atmospheres, 2024.

Schauer, J. J. and Cass, G. R.: Source apportionment of wintertime gas-phase and particle-phase air pollutants using organic compounds as tracers, Environmental science & technology, 34, 1821-1832, 2000.

Schueneman, M. K., Nault, B. A., Campuzano-Jost, P., Jo, D. S., Day, D. A., Schroder, J. C., Palm, B. B., Hodzic, A., Dibb, J. E., and Jimenez, J. L.: Aerosol pH indicator and organosulfate detectability from aerosol mass spectrometry measurements, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 14, 2237-2260, 2021.

Simoneit, B. R.: A review of biomarker compounds as source indicators and tracers for air pollution, Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 6, 159-169, 1999.

Simoneit, B. R.: Biomass burning—a review of organic tracers for smoke from incomplete combustion, Applied Geochemistry, 17, 129-162, 2002.

Simpson, W., Law, K., Schmale, J., Pratt, K., Arnold, S., Mao, J., Alexander, B., Anenberg, S., Baklanov, A., Bell, D., Brown, S., Creamean, J., Boer, G. d., DeCarlo, P., Descari, S., Elleman, R., Flynn, J., and al, e.: Alaskan Layered Pollution And Chemical Analysis (ALPACA) White Paper, 2019.

Simpson, W. R., Mao, J., Fochesatto, G. J., Law, K. S., DeCarlo, P. F., Schmale, J., Pratt, K. A., Arnold, S. R., Stutz, J., Dibb, J. E., Creamean, J. M., Weber, R. J., Williams, B. J., Alexander, B., Hu, L., Yokelson, R. J., Shiraiwa, M., Decesari, S., Anastasio, C., D'Anna, B., Gilliam, R. C., Nenes, A., St. Clair, J. M., Trost, B., Flynn, J. H., Savarino, J., Conner, L. D., Kettle, N., Heeringa, K. M., Albertin, S., Baccarini, A., Barret, B., Battaglia, M. A., Bekki, S., Brado, T. J., Brett, N., Brus, D., Campbell, J. R., Cesler-Maloney, M., Cooperdock, S., Cysneiros De Carvalho, K., Delbarre, H., DeMott, P. J., Dennehy, C. J. S., Dieudonné, E., Dingilian, K. K., Donateo, A., Doulgeris, K. M., Edwards, K. C., Fahey, K., Fang, T., Guo, F., Heinlein, L. M. D., Holen, A. L., Huff, D., Ijaz, A., Johnson, S., Kapur, S., Ketcherside, D. T., Levin, E., Lill, E., Moon, A. R., Onishi, T., Pappaccogli, G., Perkins, R., Pohorsky, R., Raut, J.-C., Ravetta, F., Roberts, T., Robinson, E. S., Scoto, F., Selimovic, V., Sunday, M. O., Temime-Roussel, B., Tian, X., Wu, J., and Yang, Y.: Overview of the Alaskan Layered Pollution and Chemical Analysis (ALPACA) Field Experiment, ACS EST Air, 1, 200–222, https://doi.org/10.1021/acsestair.3c00076, 2024.

Smith, D. M., Cui, T., Fiddler, M. N., Pokhrel, R. P., Surratt, J. D., and Bililign, S.: Laboratory studies of fresh and aged biomass burning aerosol emitted from east African biomass fuels–Part 2: Chemical properties and characterization, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 20, 10169-10191, 2020.

Smith, S. J., van Aardenne, J., Klimont, Z., Andres, R. J., Volke, A., and Delgado Arias, S.: Anthropogenic sulfur dioxide emissions: 1850–2005, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 1101-1116, 2011.

Song, S., Gao, M., Xu, W., Sun, Y., Worsnop, D. R., Jayne, J. T., Zhang, Y., Zhu, L., Li, M., Zhou, Z., Cheng, C., Lv, Y., Wang, Y., Peng, W., Xu, X., Lin, N., Wang, Y., Wang, S., Munger, J. W., Jacob, D. J., and McElroy, M. B.: Possible heterogeneous chemistry of hydroxymethanesulfonate (HMS) in northern China winter haze, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 19, 1357-1371, 10.5194/acp-19-1357-2019, 2019.

Stefenelli, G., Pospisilova, V., Lopez-Hilfiker, F. D., Daellenbach, K. R., Hüglin, C., Tong, Y., Baltensperger, U., Prévôt, A. S., and Slowik, J. G.: Organic aerosol source apportionment in Zurich using an extractive electrospray ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometer (EESI-TOF-MS)–Part 1: Biogenic influences and day–night chemistry in summer, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 19, 14825-14848, 2019a.

Stefenelli, G., Jiang, J., Bertrand, A., Bruns, E. A., Pieber, S. M., Baltensperger, U., Marchand, N., Aksoyoglu, S., Prévôt, A. S., and Slowik, J. G.: Secondary organic aerosol formation from smoldering and flaming combustion of biomass: a box model parametrization based on volatility basis set, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 19, 11461-11484, 2019b.

Sueper, D.: Squirrel and Pika Error Estimates, 2014.

Sun, Y.-L., Zhang, Q., Schwab, J., Demerjian, K., Chen, W.-N., Bae, M.-S., Hung, H.-M., Hogrefe, O., Frank, B., and Rattigan, O.: Characterization of the sources and processes of organic and inorganic aerosols in New York city with a high-resolution time-of-flight aerosol mass apectrometer, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 1581-1602, 2011.

Temime Roussel, B., Cesler-Maloney, M., Chazeau, B., Ijaz, A., Brett, N., Law, K., Bekki, S., Mao, J., Ketcherside, D., Selimovic, V., Hu, L., Simpson, W. R., and D'Anna, B.: Concentrations and Sources of VOCs during wintertime urban pollution at Fairbanks, Alaska, December 01, 20222022: https://agu.confex.com/agu/fm22/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/1072876

Tobler, A. K., Skiba, A., Canonaco, F., Močnik, G., Rai, P., Chen, G., Bartyzel, J., Zimnoch, M., Styszko, K., and Nęcki, J.: Characterization of non-refractory (NR) PM 1 and source apportionment of organic aerosol in Kraków, Poland, Atmospheric chemistry and physics, 21, 14893-14906, 2021.

Tong, Y., Pospisilova, V., Qi, L., Duan, J., Gu, Y., Kumar, V., Rai, P., Stefenelli, G., Wang, L., and Wang, Y.: Quantification of solid fuel combustion and aqueous chemistry contributions to secondary organic aerosol during wintertime haze events in Beijing, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 21, 9859-9886, 2021.

Tran, H. N. and Mölders, N.: Investigations on meteorological conditions for elevated PM2. 5 in Fairbanks, Alaska, Atmospheric Research, 99, 39-49, 2011.

Ulbrich, I., Canagaratna, M., Zhang, Q., Worsnop, D., and Jimenez, J.: Interpretation of organic components from Positive Matrix Factorization of aerosol mass spectrometric data, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 9, 2891-2918, 2009.

Wang, Y. and Hopke, P. K.: Is Alaska truly the great escape from air pollution?-long term source apportionment of fine particulate matter in Fairbanks, Alaska, Aerosol and Air Quality Research, 14, 1875-1882, 2014.

Wang, Y., Zhang, X., Sun, J., Zhang, X., Che, H., and Li, Y.: Spatial and temporal variations of the concentrations of PM 10, PM 2.5 and PM 1 in China, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 15, 13585-13598, 2015.

Ward, T., Trost, B., Conner, J., Flanagan, J., and Jayanty, R.: Source apportionment of PM2. 5 in a subarctic airshed-fairbanks, Alaska, Aerosol and Air Quality Research, 12, 536-543, 2012.

Williams, B. J., Goldstein, A. H., Kreisberg, N. M., and Hering, S. V.: An in-situ instrument for speciated organic composition of atmospheric aerosols: T hermal desorption a erosol GC/MS-FID (TAG), Aerosol Science and Technology, 40, 627-638, 2006.

Xu, W., Li, Z., Zhang, Z., Li, J., Karnezi, E., Lambe, A. T., Zhou, W., Sun, J., Du, A., and Li, Y.: Changes in physicochemical properties of organic aerosol during photochemical aging of cooking and burning emissions, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 128, e2022JD037911, 2023.

Yang, Y., Battaglia, M. A., Mohan, M. K., Robinson, E. S., DeCarlo, P. F., Edwards, K. C., Fang, T., Kapur, S., Shiraiwa, M., and Cesler-Maloney, M.: Assessing the Oxidative Potential of Outdoor PM2. 5 in Wintertime Fairbanks, Alaska, ACS ES&T Air, 2024.

Ye, L. and Wang, Y.: Long-term air quality study in Fairbanks, Alaska: Air pollutant temporal variations, correlations, and PM2. 5 source apportionment, Atmosphere, 11, 1203, 2020.

Zhang, Q., Jimenez, J. L., Canagaratna, M. R., Ulbrich, I. M., Ng, N. L., Worsnop, D. R., and Sun, Y.: Understanding atmospheric organic aerosols via factor analysis of aerosol mass spectrometry: a review, Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry, 401, 3045-3067, 2011.