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Abstract

Background: Primary (POA) and secondary (SOA) organic aerosols, deriving from both anthropogenic and biogenic sources, represent a major fraction of ambient particulate matter (PM) and play an important role in the etiology of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, largely through systemic inflammation and cellular oxidative stress. The relative contributions of these species to the inhalation burden, however, are rather poorly characterized. In this study, we measured the in vitro oxidative stress response of alveolar macrophages exposed to primary and secondary PM derived from both anthropogenic and biogenic sources.

Methods: POA and SOA were generated within an oxidation flow reactor (OFR) fed by pure, aerosolized α-pinene or gasoline engine exhaust, as representative emissions of biogenic and anthropogenic sources, respectively. The OFR utilized an ultraviolet (UV) lamp to achieve an equivalent atmospheric aging process of several days.

Results: Anthropogenic SOA produced the greatest oxidative response (1900 ± 255 µg-Zymosan/mg-PM), followed by biogenic (α-pinene) SOA (1321 ± 542 µg-Zymosan/mg-PM), while anthropogenic POA produced the smallest response (51.4 ± 64.3 µg-Zymosan/mg-PM).

Conclusions: These findings emphasize the importance of monitoring and controlling anthropogenic emissions in the urban atmosphere, while also taking into consideration spatial and seasonal differences in SOA composition. Local concentrations of biogenic and anthropogenic species contributing to the oxidative potential of ambient PM may vary widely, depending on the given region and time of year, due to factors such as surrounding vegetation, proximity to urban areas, and hours of daylight.
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Introduction

A large fraction of ambient particulate matter (PM) in the urban atmosphere consists of a mixture of primary organic aerosols (POA), derived from anthropogenic and biogenic PM sources, as well as secondary organic aerosols (SOA) produced during the photo-oxidation of both types of POA (Baltensperger et al., 2005; Després et al., 2012). Urban PM can consist of up to 90% SOA, the majority originating from primary biogenic aerosols, including the monoterpene α-pinene, one of the largest components of primary biogenic PM worldwide (Hallquist et al., 2009; Seinfeld & Pankow, 2003).

Several human health problems linked to ambient PM, including asthma, cardiovascular disease, and heart failure (Dellino et al., 2005; Dominici et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2013; Shah et al., 2013), are mediated largely by the cellular inflammatory response, including reactive oxygen species (ROS) formation (Li et al., 2003; Ray et al., 2012). Research investigating PM health effects has mostly focused on primary emissions, while studies of secondary PM effects are not as common. Some studies, however, report that both anthropogenic (Decesari et al., 2017; Saffari et al., 2015; Verma et al., 2014; Verma et al., 2015a; Verma et al., 2015b) and biogenic (Baltensperger et al., 2008; Gaschen et al., 2010; Rohr, 2013) SOA elicit greater adverse health effects than POA precursors.

In this study, we investigate the effects of photochemical oxidation on the oxidative potential of biogenic and anthropogenic PM. Samples of each PM type were collected before and after photochemical aging within a laboratory reaction chamber equipped with an ultraviolet lamp. The in vitro alveolar macrophage (AM) assay was used to quantify PM oxidative potential (Landreman et al., 2008; Li et al., 2008; Shafer et al., 2010).

Methods

Sampling methods

Photochemical oxidation of primary emissions occurred within a 64-liter stainless steel oxidation flow reactor (OFR) equipped with a single UV lamp (BHK Analamp, Model No. 82-9304-03) emitting radiation at 185 and 254 nm. Upstream of the PM sources, inlet air first passed through an activated carbon denuder and high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter to remove all particles. Within the OFR, a warm, humid environment (22°C/60% RH) was maintained, allowing H₂O to act as a source of hydroxyl radicals in the UV-catalyzed oxidation reactions, which resulted in SOA formation.

The biogenic sampling setup is depicted in Figure 1. Particle-free inlet air was introduced at a flow rate of 25 lpm. 0.5 lpm of this incoming air stream was diverted into a 250 ml Büchner flask containing a 15-ml glass vial of pure, reagent grade α-pinene. Three small holes in the vial cap allowed for diffusion of α-pinene vapors into the flask. The remaining 24.5 lpm flow of particle-free air proceeded through a humidifier (heated flask containing distilled water) and into the reactor, where it mixed with the α-pinene vapors, resulting in a dilution ratio of 50:1.

The anthropogenic sampling setup is depicted in Figure 2. Exhaust from a four-stroke single cylinder gasoline generator (Honda SHX1000, 49cc displacement, 8:1 compression ratio, operating at 3000 RPM) was drawn through a rotating disk dilutor (RDD; Testo Engineering, MD19-3E) operating at a dilution ratio of 50:1. 5 lpm of the diluted engine exhaust was diverted into the reaction chamber, where it mixed with 20 lpm of humidified, particle-free air, resulting in a total dilution ratio of 250:1.

Particles were collected downstream of the reaction chamber on Teflon and quartz filters. In the POA condition, PM was collected as the α-pinene or engine emissions passed through a dark OFR. In the SOA condition, the aerosol stream was sampled while a UV lamp was on, following a 90-minute reaction period.

Filter conditioning

Prior to sampling, quartz filters were baked in a furnace oven at 500°C for 5 hours. Teflon filters were conditioned for 24 hours in a controlled environment (23°C and 46% relative humidity) before weighing. Teflon filters were weighed before and after sampling to determine the mass collected with an MT5 Microbalance (Mettler-Toledo Inc., Columbus, OH, USA). Mass
collected on quartz filters was calculated based on the aerosol concentration (from Teflon filters) and sampling flow rate. After sampling, all filters were placed in petri dishes lined with baked aluminum foil, sealed with Teflon tape, and stored in a refrigerated environment until analysis.

Laboratory analyses
Quartz filters were analyzed for elemental carbon (EC) and organic carbon (OC) content by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Thermal Optical Transmission (TOT) Method 5040, using a flame ionization detector (FID) to quantify evolved carbon as CH\(_4\) (Birch & Cary, 1996; Peterson & Richards, 2002).

The alveolar macrophage (AM) in vitro assay was used to determine the oxidative potential of the Teflon filter PM samples. Alveolar macrophages obtained from the American Type Culture Collection (cell line NR8383, RRID: CVCL_4396) were maintained in Ham’s F12 medium (#11765-047, ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA, USA) supplemented with 2mM L-glutamine (GlutaMAX; #31765-035, ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA, USA), 1.176 g/L sodium bicarbonate, and 15% heat inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS; #45000-734, VWR, Radnor, PA, USA). Cells were cultured in flasks and kept in an incubator at 37°C/5% CO\(_2\). Non-adherent cells were transferred to new flasks weekly. A floating cell concentration of approximately 4 × 10\(^5\) cells/mL media was maintained. The macrophage cells were exposed to each type of PM sample for 2.5 hours, using 2,7-dichlorodihydrofluorescein diacetate (DCFH-DA) as a fluorescent probe to quantify the cellular formation of oxidative species. The non-fluorescent DCFH-DA acts by entering the cell, where it is de-acetylated by cellular enzymes to yield 2,7-dichlorodihydrofluorescein (DCFH), also non-fluorescent. DCFH is then oxidized by reactive species, generated during the cellular oxidative stress response to PM exposure, to form the highly fluorescent and detectable 2,7-dichlorofluorescein (DCF), which was quantified spectrophotometrically with a CytoFlour II automated fluorescence plate reader (PerSeptive Biosystems, Framingham, MA, USA) (Landreman et al., 2008; Shafer et al., 2010).

Results
EC/OC results are presented in Figure 3. EC was most abundant in engine POA (0.081 μg-EC/μg-PM), with no significant amount present in either engine or α-pinene SOA. Mass fractions of OC were higher than EC in all conditions (engine POA: 0.62 μg-OC/μg-PM, engine SOA: 0.54 μg-OC/μg-PM, α-pinene SOA: 0.54 μg-OC/μg-PM). Figure 4 presents oxidative potential results on a mass-fraction basis, standardized to Zymosan units (μg-Zymosan/mg-PM). Mass fraction results reveal how the intrinsic PM toxicity as indexed by oxidative potential changes over time due to photochemical aging. The measured oxidative potential for engine POA was 51.4 (± 64.3) μg-Zymosan/mg-PM, and for engine SOA it was 1900 (± 255) μg-Zymosan/mg-PM, while for α-pinene SOA, the result was 1321 (± 542) μg-Zymosan/mg-PM (pure α-pinene was not assayed).

Summary and conclusions
The findings of the current reaction chamber study indicate that both anthropogenic and biogenic SOA induce greater cellular oxidative stress than primary engine exhaust. This effect was found to be largest in response to engine exhaust SOA, thus implicating anthropogenic as the major contributor to adverse human health effects in urban environments, though the contribution of biogenic SOA can be quite significant in some geographical areas. Atmospheric aging of PM increases its intrinsic oxidative potential many fold, and thus photo-chemistry in a region that experiences abundant sunshine, long days, and/or stagnation of circulating air due to an inversion layer or some other reason, may increase the toxicity of PM over time.
**Figure 3.** Mass fractions of elemental carbon (EC) and organic carbon (OC) in engine primary organic aerosol (POA) and engine & α-pinene secondary organic aerosols (SOA). Error bars represent laboratory uncertainty values based on contributions of analytical error (standard deviation) and blank subtraction (standard deviation of at least three method blanks).

**Figure 4.** Mass-fraction based oxidative potential: Engine primary organic aerosol (POA) and engine & α-pinene secondary organic aerosols (SOA). Error bars represent laboratory uncertainty values based on contributions of analytical error (standard deviation) and blank subtraction (standard deviation of at least three method blanks).
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