Formation of oxidized gases and secondary organic aerosol from a commercial oxidant-generating electronic air cleaner

Taekyu Joo^a, Jean C. Rivera-Rios^b, Daniel Alvarado-Velez^b, Sabrina Westgate^b, Nga Lee Ng^{a,b,c}

^a*School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, United States*

^b*School of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, United States*

^c*School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, United States*

Abstract

Airborne virus transmission during the COVID-19 pandemic increased the demand for indoor air cleaners. While some commercial electronic air cleaners could be effective in reducing primary pollutants and inactivating bioaerosol, studies on the formation of secondary products from oxidation chemistry during their use are limited. Here, we measured oxygenated volatile organic compounds (OVOCs) and the chemical composition of particles generated from a hydroxyl radical generator in an office. During operation, enhancements in OVOCs, especially low-molecular-weight organic and inorganic acids, were detected. Rapid increases in particle number and volume concentrations were observed, corresponding to the formation of highly-oxidized secondary organic aerosol (SOA) (O:C ~1.3). The organic mass spectra showed an enhanced signal at m/z 44 (CO_2^+) and the aerosol evolved with a slope of ~ -1 in the Van Krevelen diagram. These results suggest that organic acids generated during VOC oxidation contributed to particle nucleation and SOA formation. Nitrate, sulfate, and chloride also increased during the oxidation without a

corresponding increase in ammonium, suggesting organic nitrate, organic sulfate, and organic chloride formation. As secondary species are reported to have detrimental health effects, further studies are needed to evaluate potential OVOCs and SOA formation from electronic air cleaners in different indoor environments.

Keywords: hydroxyl generator, air purifier, air cleaning, indoor air, oxidation, organic aerosol, volatile organic compounds

Synopsis: We observed formation of oxygenated volatile organic compounds and secondary organic aerosol from an electronic air cleaner.

Introduction

People spend most of their time indoors, making the air quality in these spaces an important factor for human health. Indoor air quality (IAQ) depends on several factors, including but not limited to: exchange with outdoor air, filtration, emissions from indoor sources, chemical reactions i.e., via oxidation or multi-phase processes, and deposition onto surfaces.¹ Due to the impact of IAQ on health, there is a growing demand for air cleaning technologies meant to reduce exposure to potentially detrimental substances indoors. This demand has increased considerably during the course of the recent COVID-19 (severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, SARS-CoV-2) pandemic due to the increased recognition of the role of airborne virus transmission, especially indoors.²⁻⁶

Air cleaners are usually deployed with the intention to remove indoor pollutants such as particles or volatile organic compounds (VOCs), as well as to inactivate pathogens. Two types of

air cleaning technologies are commonly used to remove particles: mechanical filtration and electronic air cleaners (e.g., ionizers and electrostatic precipitators). Gaseous pollutants such as odors and VOCs can be removed via a number of different technologies: adsorbent media air filters (e.g., activated carbon) and various electronic air cleaning devices such as photocatalytic oxidation (PCO), plasma, and ozone-generating equipment among others.⁷⁻⁹ In addition, hydroxyl radical (OH) generation via photolysis of ozone or water is also used to destroy odors and VOCs, usually as a substitute for ozone-generating air cleaners.^{10, 11} Among these cleaning technologies, ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI), ionizers, ozone oxidations, and PCO purifiers have been shown to be capable of inactivating viruses, bacteria, and other bioaerosol.^{6, 8, 9, 12-19}

There are increasing concerns regarding the use of electronic air cleaners as these devices can potentially generate unintended byproducts via oxidation chemistry similar to that in the atmosphere.^{20, 21} The oxidation mechanism of VOCs in the atmosphere can be simplified as the following: (1) initial attack of the VOCs by oxidants (OH, O₃, and NO₃), (2) organic peroxy radical reactions, and in some cases (3) alkoxy radical reactions.^{22, 23} Organic peroxy radicals can react with other species in the atmosphere (e.g., NO, NO₂, HO₂, etc.) and undergo functionalization or form alkoxy radicals. Alkoxy radicals can fragment and form smaller organic compounds in the atmosphere that can be oxidized further. Fragmentation leads to increased volatility whereas functionalization decreases volatility and increases solubility.²² These complex, multi-generational, gas-phase oxidation processes result in the formation of a large variety of organic compounds, which can undergo gas-particle partitioning and/or nucleation to form secondary organic aerosol (SOA). While some byproducts of VOC oxidation can have adverse health effects,²⁴⁻²⁹ systematic investigations of potential formation of organic gases and aerosol during the operation of oxidant/ion-generating air cleaners indoors are scarce. Previous studies are limited to investigating

the formation of ozone, NO_x, CO, CO₂, less-oxidized VOCs, or particle number and mass concentrations, but not on the composition of more-oxidized VOCs or aerosol.^{8, 9, 30}

In this work, we evaluated the effect of a commercial electronic air cleaner (hydroxyl radical generator) operated inside an office. We monitored gas-phase oxidized products and PM₁ (particulate matter less than 1 μm in diameter) size distribution and composition. We show that the operation of this device leads to the formation of small organic acids and increases PM₁ number and mass concentrations. These results show that care must be taken when choosing an adequate and appropriate air cleaning technology for a particular environment and task.

Materials and methods

The experiment was performed in an office (~ 16 m²) in the Ford Environmental Sciences and Technology Building at the Georgia Institute of Technology. We performed the experiment in the following sequence: 1) 2.33 hours of office background sampling, 2) 1.5 hours of hydroxyl generator operation (Titan Model #4000, International Ozone Technologies Group, Inc., Delray Beach, FL), and 3) 1.5 hours of sampling after the device was turned off. Briefly, the device generates OH radical and hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) via photocatalytic reaction of TiO₂ with UV-A range (365 - 385 nm) light and H₂O and O₂ in the air.^{31, 32} Many other brands of hydroxyl generator are available in the market and employ a similar technology.

Gas-phase organic compounds were measured and reported as counts per second using a high-resolution time-of-flight chemical ionization mass spectrometer (HR-ToF-CIMS, Aerodyne Research Inc., Billerica, MA) with iodide (I⁻) as a reagent ion, which selectively measures oxygenated organics.³³ O₃ and NO_x were monitored using an O₃ Analyzer (T400, Teledyne, City

of Industry, CA), a NO-NO₂-NO_x Analyzer (42C, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA), and a Cavity Attenuated Phase Shift NO₂ monitor (CAPS, Aerodyne Inc.).

Size-resolved PM₁ number and volume concentrations were measured using a scanning mobility particle sizer (SMPS). The SMPS is a combination of a differential mobility analyzer (DMA) (TSI 3040, TSI Inc., Shoreview, MN) and a condensation particle counter (CPC) (TSI 3775). In addition, we deployed a separate CPC (TSI 3025 A) to monitor the total number concentration of particles (all particles under roughly 3 μm). Aerosol chemical composition was monitored using a high-resolution time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer (HR-ToF-AMS, Aerodyne Research Inc.). HR-ToF-AMS quantifies organics, nitrate, sulfate, ammonium, and chloride mass concentrations and measures the bulk elemental composition of the particles (e.g., O:C and H:C ratios).^{34, 35} The elemental ratios for particles were calculated based on the “Improved-Ambient” method.³⁵

Results

Formation of oxidized VOCs (OVOCs). The immediate formation of oxygenated products was observed by the HR-ToF-CIMS (Figure 1) when the device was turned on. Formic acid (m/z 173, CH₂O₂I⁻), acetic acid (m/z 187, C₂H₄O₂I⁻), iminoacetic acid (m/z 200, C₂H₃NO₂I⁻), oxamide (m/z 215, C₂H₄N₂O₂I⁻), glyceraldehyde (m/z 217, C₃H₆O₃I⁻), glycerol (m/z 219, C₃H₈O₃I⁻), alanine (m/z 216, C₃H₇NO₂I⁻), and acetoacetic acid (m/z 229, C₄H₆O₃I⁻) are identified and showed the most obvious enhancements during the operation period. Enhanced glyceraldehyde and glycerol at the beginning of the experiment (12:10 pm) was likely due to the presence of people in the office initially (to set up instruments for this study), as these compounds are formed as intermediates in metabolism and widely used in cosmetics or as an additive in foods.³⁶⁻³⁸ Nitrous acid (m/z 174,

HONOI⁻), which is an inorganic acid, also increased during the operation. Hydrogen peroxide (m/z 161, H₂O₂I⁻) increased during the background period and decreased during the operation of device. As mentioned in the previous section, TiO₂ photocatalytic technology is reported to produce H₂O₂ as another product.³¹ However, H₂O₂ decreased when the device was turned on and rebounded after the device was turned off. The pre-existing H₂O₂ in the office could have been interacting with the generated OH radical but flattened as a result of regeneration via self-reaction of hydroperoxyl radical.

Formation of secondary organic aerosol. Particle number and volume concentrations started increasing once the device was in operation (Figure 2a). Both the number and volume concentrations increased rapidly in the first 30 minutes after the device was turned on and slowed down after reaching ~ 4000 particle cm⁻³ and ~ 5 μm^3 cm⁻³, respectively. This was followed by a rapid decrease in concentrations after the device was turned off. The increase in particles was mostly within the PM₁ size range based on the agreement between the SMPS (PM₁ only) and the CPC (all particles under roughly 3 μm). During the operation, an enhancement was observed in the 100 - 200 nm size range for both particle number and volume concentrations (Figure S1). It is noted that a similar experiment was performed in a laboratory space (~ 140 m²) and similar results were observed (Figure S2).

The time series of the species measured by the HR-ToF-AMS are shown in Figure 2b. A collection efficiency of 0.45 was applied to the data as the inorganic concentrations were low and the aerosol did not contain high mass fractions of acidic sulfate or ammonium nitrate.³⁹ The chemical composition of the particles during the operation period confirmed SOA formation, with organics reaching 2.1 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ after the device was turned on. Figure 2 also shows that the mass concentrations of non-refractory species reported by the HR-ToF-AMS were somewhat lower than

the volume concentration enhancement measured by the SMPS (converted to mass concentration by the density of each species, Figure S3). This difference was expected since both instruments sampled particles without the use of a dryer at the instrument inlets. Thus, the particle concentration reported by the SMPS included water whereas particle water can be evaporated in the low-pressure aerodynamic lens and vacuum system of HR-ToF-AMS.³⁹⁻⁴² The discrepancy diminishes when accounting for particle water as shown in Figure S3. Ammonium concentration was low throughout the experiment and showed little changes whereas nitrate, sulfate, and chloride increased during the device operation period. Since we did not observe ammonium increasing along with nitrate, sulfate, or chloride, these species are likely in the form of organic nitrate, organic sulfate, and organic chloride. Organic mass spectra comparison shows enhanced fraction at m/z 44 (CO_2^+) during the device operation (Figures 3a and S4), with increased O:C and decreased H:C (Figure S5a). The increase in the degree of oxidation of aerosol is further illustrated in the Van Krevelen diagram in Figure 3b.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ The aerosol evolution followed a slope of ~ -1 , with particle carbon oxidation state ($\text{OS}_\text{C} = 2 \text{ O:C} - \text{H:C}$) increasing during device operation, as a result of enhancements in O:C and reductions in H:C.⁴⁶

Discussion

Generation of hydroxyl radicals indoors reduces VOC concentrations in a similar manner to tropospheric VOC oxidation chemistry, which proceeds through complex, multi-generational chemistry and results in the formation of a large number of organic products. The byproducts formed from these reactions in this study depend on the identity of the VOCs in the office. VOCs were not measured in this work, however, Price et al.⁴⁷ speciated total organic carbon (in both gas and particle phases) in an art museum and identified that over 80% of the carbon present are highly

reduced ($OSc < -0.5$) and volatile compounds with low carbon number ($< C_6$). It is possible that the office has a similar VOC speciation, though it could have a lower total carbon budget due to no occupancy and no activities, such as printing,⁴⁸ which can lead to VOC emissions. The observed oxygenated C_1 - C_4 compounds can be formed from functionalization and fragmentation of such VOCs during the oxidation.²² Although we only observed small carboxylic acids in the gas phase, this does not exclude the formation of larger OVOCs, which might not be detected by I-CIMS, be lost in the instrument inlet line, interact with the surfaces,^{1, 47} or have participated in new particle formation and growth.⁴⁹ Increasing particle number and mass concentrations and the formation of highly-oxidized SOA suggest that new particle formation and condensation growth can be a loss process of larger, less-volatile OVOCs. The SOA formed has an O:C of ~ 1.3 , which is higher than the typical O:C range observed for more-oxidized oxygenated organic aerosol (MO-OOA) in ambient environments.^{44, 50} While both nucleation and gas-particle partitioning can lead to SOA formation, nucleation is likely the main process as particle elemental composition changed (O:C decreased and H:C increased) as soon as the device was turned off. The prevalence of nucleation is likely due to the small condensation sink with low aerosol background ($\sim 581 \text{ \# cm}^{-3}$) in the office. The enhancement of m/z 44 (CO_2^+) in the HR-ToF-AMS organic mass spectra indicates the contribution of organic acids in SOA formation, as their thermal decarboxylation gives rise to the CO_2^+ fragment.^{44, 51-54} In the Van Krevelen diagram, the SOA evolved along the ~ -1 line, which corresponds to the addition of carboxylic acids and/or simultaneous increases in alcohol and carbonyl groups.^{43, 44} Taken together, these results show that carboxylic acids were formed during the oxidation process and contributed to new particle formation owing to their low volatility.^{22, 49,}

⁵⁵

Nitrate, sulfate, and chloride enhancements are expected to be associated with organic nitrate, organic sulfate, and organic chloride formation (Figure S5). The average $\text{NO}^+/\text{NO}_2^+$ ion ratio from the HR-ToF-AMS is widely used as an indicator to differentiate inorganic vs. organic nitrate.⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸ The $\text{NO}^+/\text{NO}_2^+$ ratio for inorganic nitrate during the instrument calibration was 1.98, and previous laboratory studies have shown that this ratio is much higher for organic nitrate than inorganic nitrate.^{56, 59-61} The average $\text{NO}^+/\text{NO}_2^+$ ratio during the operation period was ~ 17 , implying that virtually all the particle-phase nitrate was organic nitrate. The contribution of organic sulfate can be examined by evaluating the fractions of HSO_3^+ and H_2SO_4^+ in H_xSO_y^+ fragments (SO^+ , SO_2^+ , SO_3^+ , HSO_3^+ , and H_2SO_4^+).⁶² Both fractions decreased when the device was turned on, implying the presence of organic sulfate. Organic chloride formation can be associated with chlorine-containing VOCs which may be emitted or formed through interactions with cleaning products.^{63, 64}

To our knowledge, this is the first study that monitored the chemical composition of secondary products in both gas and particle phases during the operation of an electronic air cleaner that dissipates oxidants in a real-world setting. Although we lack parent VOC measurements, the limited number of OVOCs and small enhancement in SOA observed during this work were assumed to be due to low initial VOCs concentrations in the office where this study was conducted. Much larger enhancements in OVOCs and SOA could be observed in other types of indoor environments such as industrial settings, homes, and restaurants, which can have much larger VOC concentrations, even more than in outdoor locations.^{1, 47, 64-66} Secondary VOC oxidation products have been shown to have detrimental effects on human health.^{24, 26, 27, 67, 68} Specifically, SOA has been reported to induce cellular reactive oxygen species (ROS) generation, inflammatory cytokine production, and oxidative modification of RNA.⁶⁹⁻⁷¹ The toxicity of SOA could increase with

increasing OS_c .^{28, 72} Therefore, future studies on air cleaning technologies should not be limited to the inactivation of bioaerosol or reduction of particular VOCs, but should also evaluate potential OVOCs and SOA formation during their operation. The electronic air cleaner tested in this study is similar to many other commercially available devices and similar experiments should be conducted with other devices.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank C. Peng, A. P. Mouat, and J. Kaiser for helpful discussions on the experimental setup and J. Lee for help in the table of content (TOC) figure illustration. The HR-ToF-CIMS was purchased through NSF Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) grant 1428738.

References

1. Abbatt, J. P. D.; Wang, C., The atmospheric chemistry of indoor environments. *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts* **2020**, 22 (1), 25-48.
2. CDC Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 and Potential Airborne Transmission. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-sars-cov-2.html> (accessed Oct, 5).
3. Lednický, J. A.; Lauzardo, M.; Hugh Fan, Z.; Jutla, A.; Tilly, T. B.; Gangwar, M.; Usmani, M.; Shankar, S. N.; Mohamed, K.; Eiguren-Fernandez, A., et al., Viable SARS-CoV-2 in the air of a hospital room with COVID-19 patients. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* **2020**.
4. Morawska, L.; Milton, D. K., It Is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**, 71 (9), 2311-2313.
5. Prather, K. A.; Wang, C. C.; Schooley, R. T., Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* **2020**, eabc6197.
6. Agarwal, N.; Meena, C. S.; Raj, B. P.; Saini, L.; Kumar, A.; Gopalakrishnan, N.; Kumar, A.; Balam, N. B.; Alam, T.; Kapoor, N. R., et al., Indoor air quality improvement in COVID-19 pandemic: Review. *Sustainable Cities and Society* **2021**, 70, 102942.
7. ASHRAE, ASHRAE Standard 52.2-2017 Method of testing general ventilation air-cleaning devices for removal efficiency by particle size. **2017**.
8. EPA, U., Residential Air Cleaners: A Technical Summary. 3rd Edition ed.; Agency, U. S. E. P., Ed. US EPA: 2018.
9. Zhang, Y.; Mo, J.; Li, Y.; Sundell, J.; Wargocki, P.; Zhang, J.; Little, J. C.; Corsi, R.; Deng, Q.; Leung, M. H. K., et al., Can commonly-used fan-driven air cleaning technologies improve indoor air quality? A literature review. *Atmospheric Environment* **2011**, 45 (26), 4329-4343.
10. Johnson, M. S.; Nilsson, E. J. K.; Svensson, E. A.; Langer, S., Gas-Phase Advanced Oxidation for Effective, Efficient in Situ Control of Pollution. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2014**, 48 (15), 8768-8776.
11. Crosley, D. R.; Araps, C. J.; Doyle-Eisele, M.; McDonald, J. D., Gas-phase photolytic production of hydroxyl radicals in an ultraviolet purifier for air and surfaces. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association* **2017**, 67 (2), 231-240.
12. Sunada, K.; Kikuchi, Y.; Hashimoto, K.; Fujishima, A., Bactericidal and Detoxification Effects of TiO₂ Thin Film Photocatalysts. *Environmental Science & Technology* **1998**, 32 (5), 726-728.
13. Grinshpun, S. A.; Adhikari, A.; Honda, T.; Kim, K. Y.; Toivola, M.; Ramchander Rao, K. S.; Reponen, T., Control of Aerosol Contaminants in Indoor Air: Combining the Particle Concentration Reduction with Microbial Inactivation. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2007**, 41 (2), 606-612.
14. Hyun, J.; Lee, S.-G.; Hwang, J., Application of corona discharge-generated air ions for filtration of aerosolized virus and inactivation of filtered virus. *Journal of Aerosol Science* **2017**, 107, 31-40.
15. Nunayon, S. S.; Zhang, H. H.; Jin, X.; Lai, A. C. K., Experimental evaluation of positive and negative air ions disinfection efficacy under different ventilation duct conditions. *Building and Environment* **2019**, 158, 295-301.

16. Riaz, N.; Khan, M. S.; Bilal, M.; Ullah, S.; Al-Sehemi, A. G., Photocatalytic Inactivation of Bioaerosols: A Short Review on Emerging Technologies. *Current Analytical Chemistry* **2021**, *17* (1), 31-37.
17. Bono, N.; Ponti, F.; Punta, C.; Candiani, G., Effect of UV Irradiation and TiO₂-Photocatalysis on Airborne Bacteria and Viruses: An Overview. *Materials* **2021**, *14* (5), 1075.
18. Luo, H.; Zhong, L., Ultraviolet germicidal irradiation (UVGI) for in-duct airborne bioaerosol disinfection: Review and analysis of design factors. *Building and Environment* **2021**, *197*, 107852.
19. Park, J.-S.; Sung, B.-J.; Yoon, K.-S.; Jeong, C.-S., The bactericidal effect of an ionizer under low concentration of ozone. *BMC Microbiol* **2016**, *16* (1), 173-173.
20. Weber, L.; Jewett, C., Schools spending millions on air purifiers often sold using overblown claims. Kaiser Health News: <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/03/health/air-filter-covid-scams-khn/index.html>, 2021.
21. Zaatari, M.; Harmon, M., Open Letter to address the use of Electronic Air Cleaning Equipment in Buildings. Medium: <https://medium.com/open-letter-to-address-the-use-of-electronic-air/no-to-ionizers-plasma-uvpco-bc1570b2fb9b>, 2021.
22. Kroll, J. H.; Seinfeld, J. H., Chemistry of secondary organic aerosol: Formation and evolution of low-volatility organics in the atmosphere. *Atmospheric Environment* **2008**, *42* (16), 3593-3624.
23. Seinfeld, J. H.; Pandis, S. N., *Atmospheric chemistry and physics: from air pollution to climate change*. John Wiley & Sons: 2016.
24. O'Brien, P. J.; Siraki, A. G.; Shangari, N., Aldehyde Sources, Metabolism, Molecular Toxicity Mechanisms, and Possible Effects on Human Health. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology* **2005**, *35* (7), 609-662.
25. Murray, C. J. L.; Aravkin, A. Y.; Zheng, P.; Abbafati, C.; Abbas, K. M.; Abbasi-Kangevari, M.; Abd-Allah, F.; Abdelalim, A.; Abdollahi, M.; Abdollahpour, I., et al., Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet* **2020**, *396* (10258), 1223-1249.
26. Hoek, G.; Krishnan, R. M.; Beelen, R.; Peters, A.; Ostro, B.; Brunekreef, B.; Kaufman, J. D., Long-term air pollution exposure and cardio- respiratory mortality: a review. *Environmental Health* **2013**, *12* (1), 43.
27. Pope, C. A.; Dockery, D. W., Health Effects of Fine Particulate Air Pollution: Lines that Connect. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association* **2006**, *56* (6), 709-742.
28. Tuet, W. Y.; Chen, Y.; Fok, S.; Champion, J. A.; Ng, N. L., Inflammatory responses to secondary organic aerosols (SOA) generated from biogenic and anthropogenic precursors. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *17* (18), 11423-11440.
29. Liu, F.; Saavedra, M. G.; Champion, J. A.; Griendling, K. K.; Ng, N. L., Prominent Contribution of Hydrogen Peroxide to Intracellular Reactive Oxygen Species Generated upon Exposure to Naphthalene Secondary Organic Aerosols. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2020**, *7* (3), 171-177.
30. Zeng, Y.; Manwatkar, P.; Laguerre, A.; Beke, M.; Kang, I.; Ali, A. S.; Farmer, D. K.; Gall, E. T.; Heidarinejad, M.; Stephens, B., Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation. *Building and Environment* **2021**, *195*, 107750.

31. Schneider, J.; Matsuoka, M.; Takeuchi, M.; Zhang, J.; Horiuchi, Y.; Anpo, M.; Bahnemann, D. W., Understanding TiO₂ Photocatalysis: Mechanisms and Materials. *Chemical Reviews* **2014**, *114* (19), 9919-9986.
32. IOTG, Titan 4000 Brochures. Group, I. O. T., Ed. International Ozone Technologies Group: <http://internationalozone.com/Sources.html>, 2020.
33. Aljawhary, D.; Lee, A. K. Y.; Abbatt, J. P. D., High-resolution chemical ionization mass spectrometry (ToF-CIMS): application to study SOA composition and processing. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* **2013**, *6* (11), 3211-3224.
34. DeCarlo, P. F.; Kimmel, J. R.; Trimborn, A.; Northway, M. J.; Jayne, J. T.; Aiken, A. C.; Gonin, M.; Fuhrer, K.; Horvath, T.; Docherty, K. S., et al., Field-Deployable, High-Resolution, Time-of-Flight Aerosol Mass Spectrometer. *Analytical Chemistry* **2006**, *78* (24), 8281-8289.
35. Canagaratna, M. R.; Jimenez, J. L.; Kroll, J. H.; Chen, Q.; Kessler, S. H.; Massoli, P.; Hildebrandt Ruiz, L.; Fortner, E.; Williams, L. R.; Wilson, K. R., et al., Elemental ratio measurements of organic compounds using aerosol mass spectrometry: characterization, improved calibration, and implications. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *15* (1), 253-272.
36. Bagnato, G.; Iulianelli, A.; Sanna, A.; Basile, A., Glycerol Production and Transformation: A Critical Review with Particular Emphasis on Glycerol Reforming Reaction for Producing Hydrogen in Conventional and Membrane Reactors. *Membranes (Basel)* **2017**, *7* (2), 17.
37. Clough, S. R., Glyceraldehyde. In *Encyclopedia of Toxicology (Third Edition)*, Wexler, P., Ed. Academic Press: Oxford, 2014; pp 752-753.
38. Wernke, M. J., Glycerol. In *Encyclopedia of Toxicology (Third Edition)*, Wexler, P., Ed. Academic Press: Oxford, 2014; pp 754-756.
39. Middlebrook, A. M.; Bahreini, R.; Jimenez, J. L.; Canagaratna, M. R., Evaluation of Composition-Dependent Collection Efficiencies for the Aerodyne Aerosol Mass Spectrometer using Field Data. *Aerosol Science and Technology* **2012**, *46* (3), 258-271.
40. Murphy, D. M., The design of single particle laser mass spectrometers. *Mass Spectrometry Reviews* **2007**, *26* (2), 150-165.
41. Zelenyuk, A.; Imre, D.; Cuadra-Rodriguez, L. A., Evaporation of Water from Particles in the Aerodynamic Lens Inlet: An Experimental Study. *Analytical Chemistry* **2006**, *78* (19), 6942-6947.
42. Engelhart, G. J.; Hildebrandt, L.; Kostenidou, E.; Mihalopoulos, N.; Donahue, N. M.; Pandis, S. N., Water content of aged aerosol. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *11* (3), 911-920.
43. Heald, C. L.; Kroll, J. H.; Jimenez, J. L.; Docherty, K. S.; DeCarlo, P. F.; Aiken, A. C.; Chen, Q.; Martin, S. T.; Farmer, D. K.; Artaxo, P., A simplified description of the evolution of organic aerosol composition in the atmosphere. *Geophysical Research Letters* **2010**, *37* (8).
44. Ng, N. L.; Canagaratna, M. R.; Jimenez, J. L.; Chhabra, P. S.; Seinfeld, J. H.; Worsnop, D. R., Changes in organic aerosol composition with aging inferred from aerosol mass spectra. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *11* (13), 6465-6474.
45. Van Krevelen, D., Graphical-statistical method for the study of structure and reaction processes of coal. *Fuel* **1950**, *29*, 269-284.
46. Kroll, J. H.; Donahue, N. M.; Jimenez, J. L.; Kessler, S. H.; Canagaratna, M. R.; Wilson, K. R.; Altieri, K. E.; Mazzoleni, L. R.; Wozniak, A. S.; Bluhm, H., et al., Carbon oxidation state as a metric for describing the chemistry of atmospheric organic aerosol. *Nature Chemistry* **2011**, *3* (2), 133-139.

47. Price, D. J.; Day, D. A.; Pagonis, D.; Stark, H.; Algrim, L. B.; Handschy, A. V.; Liu, S.; Krechmer, J. E.; Miller, S. L.; Hunter, J. F., et al., Budgets of Organic Carbon Composition and Oxidation in Indoor Air. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2019**, *53* (22), 13053-13063.
48. Destailhats, H.; Maddalena, R. L.; Singer, B. C.; Hodgson, A. T.; McKone, T. E., Indoor pollutants emitted by office equipment: A review of reported data and information needs. *Atmospheric Environment* **2008**, *42* (7), 1371-1388.
49. Tröstl, J.; Chuang, W. K.; Gordon, H.; Heinritzi, M.; Yan, C.; Molteni, U.; Ahlm, L.; Frege, C.; Bianchi, F.; Wagner, R., et al., The role of low-volatility organic compounds in initial particle growth in the atmosphere. *Nature* **2016**, *533* (7604), 527-531.
50. Jimenez, J. L.; Canagaratna, M. R.; Donahue, N. M.; Prevot, A. S. H.; Zhang, Q.; Kroll, J. H.; DeCarlo, P. F.; Allan, J. D.; Coe, H.; Ng, N. L., et al., Evolution of Organic Aerosols in the Atmosphere. *Science* **2009**, *326* (5959), 1525-1529.
51. Alfarra, M. R.; Coe, H.; Allan, J. D.; Bower, K. N.; Boudries, H.; Canagaratna, M. R.; Jimenez, J. L.; Jayne, J. T.; Garforth, A. A.; Li, S.-M., et al., Characterization of urban and rural organic particulate in the Lower Fraser Valley using two Aerodyne Aerosol Mass Spectrometers. *Atmospheric Environment* **2004**, *38* (34), 5745-5758.
52. Duplissy, J.; DeCarlo, P. F.; Dommen, J.; Alfarra, M. R.; Metzger, A.; Barmapadimos, I.; Prevot, A. S. H.; Weingartner, E.; Tritscher, T.; Gysel, M., et al., Relating hygroscopicity and composition of organic aerosol particulate matter. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *11* (3), 1155-1165.
53. Marcolli, C.; Canagaratna, M. R.; Worsnop, D. R.; Bahreini, R.; de Gouw, J. A.; Warneke, C.; Goldan, P. D.; Kuster, W. C.; Williams, E. J.; Lerner, B. M., et al., Cluster Analysis of the Organic Peaks in Bulk Mass Spectra Obtained During the 2002 New England Air Quality Study with an Aerodyne Aerosol Mass Spectrometer. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *6* (12), 5649-5666.
54. Aiken, A. C.; DeCarlo, P. F.; Jimenez, J. L., Elemental Analysis of Organic Species with Electron Ionization High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry. *Analytical Chemistry* **2007**, *79* (21), 8350-8358.
55. Pankow, J. F.; Asher, W. E., SIMPOL.1: a simple group contribution method for predicting vapor pressures and enthalpies of vaporization of multifunctional organic compounds. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *8* (10), 2773-2796.
56. Farmer, D. K.; Matsunaga, A.; Docherty, K. S.; Surratt, J. D.; Seinfeld, J. H.; Ziemann, P. J.; Jimenez, J. L., Response of an aerosol mass spectrometer to organonitrates and organosulfates and implications for atmospheric chemistry. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **2010**, *107* (15), 6670-6675.
57. Xu, L.; Suresh, S.; Guo, H.; Weber, R. J.; Ng, N. L., Aerosol characterization over the southeastern United States using high-resolution aerosol mass spectrometry: spatial and seasonal variation of aerosol composition and sources with a focus on organic nitrates. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *15* (13), 7307-7336.
58. Ng, N. L.; Brown, S. S.; Archibald, A. T.; Atlas, E.; Cohen, R. C.; Crowley, J. N.; Day, D. A.; Donahue, N. M.; Fry, J. L.; Fuchs, H., et al., Nitrate radicals and biogenic volatile organic compounds: oxidation, mechanisms, and organic aerosol. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *17* (3), 2103-2162.
59. Boyd, C.; Sanchez, J.; Xu, L.; Eugene, A. J.; Nah, T.; Tuet, W.; Guzman, M. I.; Ng, N., Secondary organic aerosol formation from the β -pinene+ NO₃ system: effect of humidity and peroxy radical fate. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2015**, *15* (13), 7497-7522.
60. Bruns, E. A.; Perraud, V. r.; Zelenyuk, A.; Ezell, M. J.; Johnson, S. N.; Yu, Y.; Imre, D.; Finlayson-Pitts, B. J.; Alexander, M. L., Comparison of FTIR and particle mass spectrometry

- for the measurement of particulate organic nitrates. *Environmental science & technology* **2010**, *44* (3), 1056-1061.
61. Fry, J.; Kiendler-Scharr, A.; Rollins, A.; Wooldridge, P.; Brown, S.; Fuchs, H.; Dubé, W.; Mensah, A.; Maso, M. d.; Tillmann, R., Organic nitrate and secondary organic aerosol yield from NO₃ oxidation of β -pinene evaluated using a gas-phase kinetics/aerosol partitioning model. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **2009**, *9* (4), 1431-1449.
62. Chen, Y.; Xu, L.; Humphry, T.; Hettiyadura, A. P. S.; Ovadnevaite, J.; Huang, S.; Poulain, L.; Schroder, J. C.; Campuzano-Jost, P.; Jimenez, J. L., et al., Response of the Aerodyne Aerosol Mass Spectrometer to Inorganic Sulfates and Organosulfur Compounds: Applications in Field and Laboratory Measurements. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2019**, *53* (9), 5176-5186.
63. Mattila, J. M.; Arata, C.; Wang, C.; Katz, E. F.; Abeleira, A.; Zhou, Y.; Zhou, S.; Goldstein, A. H.; Abbatt, J. P. D.; DeCarlo, P. F., et al., Dark Chemistry during Bleach Cleaning Enhances Oxidation of Organics and Secondary Organic Aerosol Production Indoors. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2020**, *7* (11), 795-801.
64. Mattila, J. M.; Lakey, P. S. J.; Shiraiwa, M.; Wang, C.; Abbatt, J. P. D.; Arata, C.; Goldstein, A. H.; Ampollini, L.; Katz, E. F.; DeCarlo, P. F., et al., Multiphase Chemistry Controls Inorganic Chlorinated and Nitrogenated Compounds in Indoor Air during Bleach Cleaning. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2020**, *54* (3), 1730-1739.
65. Weschler, C. J., Changes in indoor pollutants since the 1950s. *Atmospheric Environment* **2009**, *43* (1), 153-169.
66. Singer, B. C.; Coleman, B. K.; Destailats, H.; Hodgson, A. T.; Lunden, M. M.; Weschler, C. J.; Nazaroff, W. W., Indoor secondary pollutants from cleaning product and air freshener use in the presence of ozone. *Atmospheric Environment* **2006**, *40* (35), 6696-6710.
67. Anderson, J. O.; Thundiyil, J. G.; Stolbach, A., Clearing the Air: A Review of the Effects of Particulate Matter Air Pollution on Human Health. *Journal of Medical Toxicology* **2012**, *8* (2), 166-175.
68. Li, N.; Xia, T.; Nel, A. E., The role of oxidative stress in ambient particulate matter-induced lung diseases and its implications in the toxicity of engineered nanoparticles. *Free Radical Biology and Medicine* **2008**, *44* (9), 1689-1699.
69. Gaschen, A.; Lang, D.; Kalberer, M.; Savi, M.; Geiser, T.; Gazdhar, A.; Lehr, C.-M.; Bur, M.; Dommen, J.; Baltensperger, U., et al., Cellular Responses after Exposure of Lung Cell Cultures to Secondary Organic Aerosol Particles. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2010**, *44* (4), 1424-1430.
70. Gonzalez-Rivera, J. C.; Baldrige, K. C.; Wang, D. S.; Patel, K.; Chuvalo-Abraham, J. C. L.; Hildebrandt Ruiz, L.; Contreras, L. M., Post-transcriptional air pollution oxidation to the cholesterol biosynthesis pathway promotes pulmonary stress phenotypes. *Communications Biology* **2020**, *3* (1), 392.
71. Fushimi, A.; Nakajima, D.; Furuyama, A.; Suzuki, G.; Ito, T.; Sato, K.; Fujitani, Y.; Kondo, Y.; Yoshino, A.; Ramasamy, S., et al., Source contributions to multiple toxic potentials of atmospheric organic aerosols. *Science of The Total Environment* **2021**, *773*, 145614.
72. Tuet, W. Y.; Chen, Y.; Fok, S.; Gao, D.; Weber, R. J.; Champion, J. A.; Ng, N. L., Chemical and cellular oxidant production induced by naphthalene secondary organic aerosol (SOA): effect of redox-active metals and photochemical aging. *Scientific Reports* **2017**, *7* (1), 15157.

Figures

Figure 1. HR-ToF-CIMS results showing (a) grey: office background mass spectrum / blue: mass spectrum during hydroxyl generator operation, (b) the mass spectrum difference between before and during the operation of hydroxyl generator, and (c) time evolution of selected species. The data are 10-min averaged data and are normalized by the maximum signal of each species. The hydroxyl generator was in operation from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm (highlighted in yellow). Glyceraldehyde (m/z 217, $\text{C}_3\text{H}_6\text{O}_3\text{I}^-$) is not included in the mass spectrum in (b) due to its rapid decay after the formation.

Figure 2. Time series of (a) particle number (CPC and SMPS) and volume concentrations (SMPS) and (b) non-refractory species concentrations (HR-ToF-AMS). The mass fraction of different non-refractory species during the hydroxyl generator operation is shown in the pie chart. The hydroxyl generator was in operation from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm (highlighted in yellow).

Figure 3. HR-ToF-AMS results showing (a) organic mass spectra comparison between during device operation and office background and (b) VK-triangle diagram of organics. The black lines encompass the triangular space occupied by ambient SOA.⁴⁴ The carbon oxidation states (OS_C) are shown with grey dotted lines. The blue data points correspond to office background and the red data points correspond to device operation.

468 For TOC only

469