# Tandem Configurations of Different Aerosol Classifiers with the Aerodynamic Aerosol

## Classifier (AAC)

## BACKGROUND

The Aerodynamic Aerosol Classifier (AAC) is a novel aerosol instrument that classifies particles based on their aerodynamic diameter ( $d_a$ , i.e. centrifugal-to-drag force ratio). It selects particles independent of their charge-state and has a transmission efficiency 2.6 to 5.1 times higher than current electrostatic classifiers, while producing a monodispersed aerosol with no multiple-charging artifacts (Johnson et al.,

## AAC

The AAC selects particles of a particular aerodynamic diameter by generating a control sheath flow and passing it between two rotating concentric cylinders as shown in Figure 1. This rotation induces a known centrifugal force on each individual particle. Particles with larger aerodynamic diameters impact the outer surface of the classifier, while particles with aerodynamic diameters smaller than the AAC setpoint remain entrained in the sheath flow. Therefore, only particles with the correct aerodynamic diameter pass through the AAC classifier.

Martin Irwin<sup>1,\*</sup>, T.J. Johnson<sup>2,3</sup>, R.T. Nishida<sup>2</sup>, J.P.R. Symonds<sup>1</sup>

#### J.S. Olfert<sup>3</sup> and A.M. Boies<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cambustion Ltd., J6 The Paddocks, 347 Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge, CB18DH, United Kingdom \*Now at Laboratory of Atmospheric Chemistry, Paul Scherrer Institut, 5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 1PZ, U.K.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2G8, Canada

#### **Total Transmission Efficiency**

#### 2018).

These characteristics allow the AAC to be utilized for a wide range of applications, including different configurations with other aerosol classifiers, such as the Differential Mobility Analyzer (DMA) and Centrifugal Particle Mass Analyzer (CPMA). The DMA and CPMA classify particles based on their mobility diameter ( $d_{
m m}$ , i.e. electrostatic-to-drag force ratio) and mass-tocharge  $(m_p/q, i.e.$  centrifugal-to-electrostatic force ratio), respectively.

While tandem DMAs and DMA-CPMA configurations have been previously studied, limited research has investigated AAC-DMA or AAC-CPMA systems. We present here an investigation into the relationships between these different particle properties for spherical morphologies.



Figure 1: AAC operating principle (https://www.cambustion.com/products/aac/animation)



## METHODOLOGY

This study used an AAC to select particles based on their aerodynamic diameter from a polydispersed DOS (Bis-2ethylhexyl sebacate) aerosol generated using a BGI Collison nebulizer. The particle mobility and mass of the AAC classified aerosol was determined by diluting, charging and dividing the sample between a stepping DMA and stepping CPMA in parallel as shown in Figure 3. The particle number concentration of each

## TANDEM INVERSION

The charge-states of the monodispersed aerosol produced by the AAC appeared as distinct peaks in the DMA or CPMA scans as shown in Figure 4. The area under the AAC-DMA peaks relative to the AAC classified particle number concentration  $(N_1)$  was used to determine the particle charging fractions  $(f_n)$ , while the position of the peaks in the mobility  $(d_{m,2}^*)$  or mass  $(m_{\rm p,2}^*)$  domain relative to the AAC aerodynamic diameter setpoint  $(d_{\rm a,1}^*)$  was used to determine the effective particle density. These measurements were calculated by fitting the theoretical tandem transfer function for particle charge states  $n_{\min}$  to  $n_{\max}$  to the data from each tandem configuration using chi-squared minimization as follows:



classified aerosol  $(N_2)$  was measured using a twice Condensation Particle Counter (CPC) and recorded as a function of the downstream classifier (i.e. DMA or CPMA) setpoint.



$$\frac{N_2}{N_1} = \frac{\lambda_{\Omega,\text{DS}} \sum_{n=n_{\min}}^{n_{\max}} f_n \int \Omega_{\text{AAC}} \cdot \Omega_{\text{DS},n} \cdot dx}{\int \Omega_{\text{AAC}} \cdot dd_a}$$

(Eq1)

Where  $\Omega_{AAC}$  is the AAC transfer function, while  $\lambda_{\Omega,DS}$ ,  $\Omega_{DS,n}$  and x are the transmission efficiency, transfer function and measurand of the downstream (DS) electrostatic classifier (i.e. DMA or CPMA), respectively. Based on previous studies (Birmili et al., 1997; Johnson et al., 2018; Reavell et al., 2011), each of the three classifiers' transfer function was approximated as a triangle. The dashed line shown in each inversion example subplot is the inversion initial guess based on theory. The theoretical charge fractions were estimated based on Wiedensohler (1988) and Gunn & Woessner (1956), while the effective particle density was known (914 kg/m<sup>3</sup>).

Figure 4: Example tandem AAC- electrostatic classifier scans with a 358 nm aerodynamic diameter AAC setpoint

## RESULTS

A minimum of four parallel AAC-DMA and AAC-CPMA scans were completed at each AAC setpoint. Two scans with positive electrostatic classifier voltages and the other two with negative. Due to the low concentration at small particle sizes of the aerosol source, as well as the lower transmission efficiency of the CPMA compared to the DMA, the 40 nm AAC-CPMA  $N_2$  measurements were too low to reliably process. The average effective densities measured by both tandem systems is shown in Figure 5, while the charge fractions measured by the AAC-DMA system is shown in Figure 6.



## SUMMARY

The average effective particle densities measured by the AAC-DMA and AAC-CPMA agreed within 7.3% and 12.9% of predicted (914 kg/m<sup>3</sup>), respectively.

The average absolute difference between the charge fractions measured by the AAC-DMA system and theory was 1.08%. These results also demonstrate the capability of the AAC-DMA system to resolve up to 13 charge states.

The average effective particle densities measured by the AAC-DMA and AAC-CPMA agreed within 7.3% and 12.9% of predicted (914 kg/m<sup>3</sup>), respectively. These maximums are equivalent to 2.57% or 2.03% setpoint uncertainty in the AAC and DMA or AAC and CPMA, respectively, assuming the uncertainty between the classifiers in each

മ് -10 -15 蚕······ AAC-DMA - - - - - AAC-CPMA -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 10<sup>2</sup>  $10^{3}$ Particle Elementary Charge State, n AAC Aerodynamic Diameter Setpoint,  $d_{2,1}^{*}$  (nm)

Figure 5: Agreement between known Figure 6: Agreement between charge fractions and measured effective densities measured by the AAC-DMA and theory

tandem arrangement is equal. Both tandem systems measured larger effective densities as the particle aerodynamic diameter increased. An approximately linear trend was also identified by Johnson et al. (2018) for classification agreement between tandem AACs.

The agreement of the charge fractions measured by the tandem AAC-DMA with theory (Wiedensohler, 1988; Gunn & Woessner, 1956) is shown in Figure 6. The average absolute difference between the measured and predicted values was 1.08%; however, this average difference isn't uniform. As particle size increases, theory predicts higher negative one charge and neutral charge fractions, and lower positive two to five charge fractions than the measured values. These results also demonstrate the capability of the AAC-DMA system to resolve up to 13 charge states (6 positive, 6 negative and the neutral) at one particle size.

The high agreement between the measured and predicted values for both the charge fractions and effective density validate these novel tandem aerosol classifier configurations and supporting inversions.

#### REFERENCES

Birmili, W., Stratmann, F., Wiedensohler, A., Covert, D., Russell, L.M., and Berg, O. (1997). Determination of Differential Mobility Analyzer Transfer Functions Using Identical Instruments in Series. Aerosol Sci. Technol., 27(2):215–223.

Gunn, R., & Woessner, R. H. (1956). Measurements of the systematic electrification of aerosols. Journal of Colloid Science, 11(3), 254–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/0095-8522(56)90050-2

ohnson, T.J., Irwin, M., Symonds, J.P.R., Olfert, J.S., and Boies, A.M. (2018). Measuring aerosol size distributions with the aerodynamic aerosol classifier. Aerosol Sci. Technol., 52(6):1–11.

Reavell, K.S.J., Symonds, J.P.R., and Rushton, M.G. (2011). Simplified approximations to Centrifugal Particle Mass Analyser performance., in European Aerosol Conference (EAC) 2011, Manchester, U.K, September, 2011

Wiedensohler, A. (1988). An approximation of the bipolar charge distribution for particles in the submicron size range. Journal of Aerosol Science, 19(3), 387–389. https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8502(88)90278-9