1	Supporting Information for
2	The influence of the Clean Air Actions on the health risk of
3	atmospheric polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
4	Fu-Jie Zhu <sup>1,2,3,4</sup> , Long-Ze Qu <sup>3</sup>
5	
6	<sup>1</sup> International Joint Research Center for Persistent Toxic Substances (IJRC-PTS),
7	State Key Laboratory of Urban Water Resource and Environment, Harbin Institute of
8	Technology, Harbin 150090, Heilongjiang, China.
9	<sup>2</sup> School of Environment, Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, University of
10	Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hangzhou 310024, Zhejiang, China.
11	<sup>3</sup> School of Energy and Environmental Engineering, Hebei University of Technology,
12	Tianjin 300401, China.
13	<sup>4</sup> Heilongjiang Provincial Key Laboratory of Polar Environment and Ecosystem
14	(HPKL-PEE), Harbin 150090, Heilongjiang, China.
15	

Contents Table S2. The exposure factors for daily exposure dose for different age groups..7 Table S3. Statistical summary of  $\sum BaP_{eq}$  concentration (ng m<sup>-3</sup>) of 15 atmospheric PAHs in the particle phase, gas phase, and total phase in Harbin from June 2014 to 

### 26 **S1. Text**

## 27 Text S1. Sampling and analytical procedure of PAHs

The air samples were collected at an urban site (latitude: 45°45′28″ N; longitude: 28 126°40'49" E) in Harbin, the capital city of Heilongjiang Province in northeastern 29 China. Normally, almost weekly air samples were collected by a high-volume air 30 sampler (TE-1000, Tisch Environmental, Ohio, USA) with an air flow of 0.24 std 31 m<sup>3</sup>/min for 24 h from June 2014 to May 2019. In total, 194 pairs of gas phase and 32 particle phase samples (total suspended particles) were collected in the long-term 33 34 monitoring program. The sampling and analytical procedures were modified from our previous studies (Ma et al. 2010, Ma et al. 2018). In brief, gas phase and particle 35 phase samples were collected on polyurethane foam (PUF) plugs and glass fiber 36 37 filters (GFFs), respectively. After sampling, GFFs and PUFs were spiked with surrogates and then extracted and purified by the Soxhlet extraction method and 38 active silica gel column, respectively. 39

In total, 15 priority PAHs were analyzed by an Agilent 6890N GC coupled with 40 an Agilent 5973 mass spectrometer detector: acenaphthylene (Acy), acenaphthene 41 42 (Ace), fluorene (Flu), phenanthrene (Phe), anthracene (Ant), fluoranthene (Fluo), pyrene (Pyr), BaA, benz[a]anthracene (BaA), chrysene (Chr), benzo[b]fluoranthene 43 44 (BbF), benzo[k]fluoranthene (BkF), benzo[a]pyrene (BaP), dibenz[a,h]anthracene 45 (DahA), indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene (IcdP), and benzo[g,h,i]perylene (BghiP). Separation was achieved using  $30m \times 0.25 \text{ mm} \times 0.25 \mu \text{m}$  HP-5MS capillary column (Agilent 46 Co., USA) in selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode. The quantitative ions and the 47 qualitative ions for PAHs and the PAH surrogates were shown in Table S1. A 2.0 µL 48 volume of sample was injected in the splitless mode. The column temperature 49 programs were used as follows: held at 90 °C for 1 min, then raised from 90 °C to 180 50

- 51 °C with 10 °C /min, held for 1 min, from 180 °C to 280 °C at 3 °C/min, held for 20
- 52 min.
- 53

# 54 Text S2. Quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC)

The field blank was confirmed, with only trace levels of some low ring PAHs 55 being detected by loading a precleaned PUF plug and GFF into the sampler for 1 min 56 57 with no air drawing through for each month. For each batch of real samples, one lab blank was added to check the background interference during the experiment. The 58 results indicated that only trace levels of low molecular weight PAHs could be 59 detected in laboratory blanks. The average recoveries of the three surrogates (Flu-D10, 60 Pyr-D10, and Perylene-D12) were 80%, 87%, and 69% for PUF samples and 75%, 61 92%, and 80% for GFF samples, respectively. The final reported concentrations were 62 surrogate corrected but not blank corrected. The instrument and method detection 63 limits ranged from 0.10 ng/mL to 0.73 ng/mL and from 0.0180 ng/m<sup>3</sup> to 0.0774 ng/m<sup>3</sup>, 64 65 respectively.

#### S2. Tables 67

PAHs	Abb.ª	TEFs	Halving time <sup>b</sup>	Quantitative ion	Qualitative ion
acenaphthylene	Acy	0.001	$4.78 \pm 0.963$	152.1	151.1
acenaphthene	Ace	0.001	$3.03 \pm 0.352$	153.1	154.1
fluorene	Flu	0.001	$3.10\pm0.328$	166.1	165.1
phenanthrene	Phe	0.001	$3.09 \pm 0.323$	178.1	176.1
anthracene	Ant	0.01	$2.27\pm0.258$	178.1	176.1
fluoranthene	Fluo	0.001	$3.62\pm0.510$	202.1	200.1
pyrene	Pyr	0.001	$3.74 \pm 0.550$	202.1	200.1
benzo[a]anthracene	BaA	0.1	$3.17 \pm 0.439$	228	226
chrysene	Chr	0.01	$3.05 \pm 0.371$	228	226
benzo[b]fluoranthene	BbF	0.1	$5.03\pm0.901$	252	250
benzo[k]fluoranthene	BkF	0.1	$3.69 \pm 0.533$	252	250
benzo[a]pyrene	BaP	1	$3.92 \pm 0.605$	252	250
indeo[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	IcdP	0.1	$4.18 \pm 0.659$	276	274
dibenzo[a,h]anthracene	DahA	1	$3.20 \pm 0.421$	278	276
benzo[g.h,j]perylene	BghiP	0.01	$3.56 \pm 0.483$	276	274

Table S1. Toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) and Halving time for the 15 PAHs 68

Note: a, Abbreviation; b Halving time for the concentrations of 15 PAHs in the bulk air 69

70 71 (particle plus gas phase) is cited from study<sup>[1]</sup>.

Parameter	Unit		Distribution	Children (1-11)	Adolescent (12-17)	Adult (18-70)
IR <sup>a</sup>	$m^3 day^{-1}$	mean (95%)	lognormal	8.9 (10.2)	13.9 (18.7)	16.7 (21.1)
$EF^{b}$	dimensionless	mean (95%)	lognormal	0.0972 (0.25)	0.0618 (0.101)	0.126 (0.333)
$BW^{\mathrm{a}}$	kg	mean (95%)	normal	19.7 (25.8)	50.9 (71.1)	67.2 (88.2)
SAª	m <sup>2</sup>	mean (95%)	normal	0.148 (0.174)	0.230 (0.284)	0.209 (0.246)
$AF^{\mathrm{d}}$	mg cm <sup>-2</sup> event <sup>-1</sup>	geomean (geosd)	lognormal	0.04 (3.41)	0.04 (3.41)	0.02 (2.67)
$EV^{d}$	events day <sup>-1</sup>	-	-	1	1	1
$ABS_{ m d}{}^{ m d}$	dimensionless	geomean (geosd)	lognormal	0.13 (1.26)	0.13 (1.26)	0.13 (1.26)
$CSF_{i}^{e}$	kg day $mg^{-1}$	geomean (geosd)	lognormal	3.14 (1.80)	3.14 (1.80)	3.14 (1.80)
$CSF_d^{e}$	kg day mg <sup>-1</sup>	-	-	37.47	37.47	37.47
ADAF	dimensionless	-	-	1-2 years old: 10; 3-11 years old: 3	12-15 years old: 3; 16-17 years old: 1	1

72 Table S2. The exposure factors for daily exposure dose for different age groups.

73 a, the parameters for children and adolescents were the statistical data cited from the Chinese Exposure Factors Handbook (Children)<sup>[2]</sup>. The parameters for adults

74 were the statistical data cited from Exposure Factors Handbook of Chinese Population (Adults)<sup>[3]</sup>.

b, the values of EF were calculated from the outdoor time (*T*, min) in a day using  $EF = T/60/24^{[2,3]}$ .

c, the data were calculated from the different percentage of the total body surface area from the handbooks<sup>[2, 3]</sup>.

d, the data were cited from the Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund that developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)<sup>[4]</sup>.

e,  $CSF_i$  and  $CSF_d$  were the cancer slope factors for inhalation exposure and dermal contact, respectively<sup>[5]</sup>.

79

81 Table S3. Statistical summary of  $\sum BaP_{eq}$  concentration (ng m<sup>-3</sup>) of 15 atmospheric

82 PAHs in the particle phase, gas phase, and total phase in Harbin from June 2014 to

83 May 2019.

Period	Mean	SD	Media	Range (min-max)	Range (25%-75%)		
Particle phase							
2014.6~2015.5	7.99	12.2	3.06	0.450 - 43.4	0.741 - 7.37		
2015.6~2016.5	9.39	15.6	1.45	0.244 - 59.5	0.525 - 12.3		
2016.6~2017.5	9.47	12.7	1.44	0.169 - 54.0	0.698 - 16.2		
2017.6~2018.5	7.71	12.1	1.84	0.211 - 42.2	0.612 - 10.3		
2018.6~2019.5	3.46	3.85	1.38	0.123 - 13.2	0.509 - 5.63		
All	7.67	12.1	1.84	0.123 - 59.5	0.654 - 9.26		
Gas phase							
2014.6~2015.5	0.210	0.163	0.150	0.0443 - 0.712	0.109 - 0.255		
2015.6~2016.5	0.214	0.181	0.146	0.0330 - 0.885	0.0845 - 0.312		
2016.6~2017.5	0.129	0.108	0.0970	0.0473 - 0.594	0.0659 - 0.140		
2017.6~2018.5	0.165	0.179	0.0906	0.0208 - 0.809	0.0535 - 0.203		
2018.6~2019.5	0.0800	0.0624	0.0610	0.0167 - 0.353	0.0388 - 0.110		
All	0.164	0.157	0.115	0.0167 - 0.885	0.0646 - 0.196		
Total phase							
2014.6~2015.5	8.20	12.3	3.16	0.520 - 44.1	0.946 - 7.53		
2015.6~2016.5	9.61	15.7	1.57	0.327 - 60.0	0.634 - 12.7		
2016.6~2017.5	9.60	12.8	1.51	0.217 - 54.7	0.800 - 16.3		
2017.6~2018.5	7.88	12.2	2.01	0.292 - 42.5	0.695 - 10.3		
2018.6~2019.5	3.54	3.90	1.42	0.147 - 13.4	0.570 - 5.74		
All	7.83	12.2	2.02	0.147 - 60.0	0.736 - 9.43		

84

## 86 **References**

- (1) Zhu, Fu-Jie; Ma, Wan-Li; Hu, Peng-Tuan; Zhang, Zi-Feng; Li, Yi-Fan. Temporal trends of
   atmospheric PAHs: Implications for the influence of the clean air action. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 2021, *296*, 126494. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126494.
- 90 (2) Duan, Xiaoli; Zhao, Xiuge; Wang, Beibei; Chen, Yiting; Cao, Suzhen. In Highlights of the 91 Handbook (Children), Chinese Exposure Factors Academic Press, 2016. 92 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311607926 Highlight of Chinese Children' 93 s Exposure Factors Handbook zhongguoertongbaolucanshushoucegaiyao#fullTextFile 94 Content.
- 95 (3) Duan, Xiaoli; Zhao, Xiuge; Wang, Beibei; Chen, Yiting; Cao, Suzhen. In *Highlights of the* 96 *Chinese Exposure Factors Handbook (Adults)*, Academic Press, 2015; p vii. DOI:
   97 10.1016/B978-0-12-803125-4.00005-5.
- 98 (4) USEPA. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Human Health Evaluation Manual, Pt E,
   99 Supplemental Guidance for Dermal Risk Assessment.; 2004.
- (5) Liao, ChungMin; Chiang, KuoChih. Probabilistic risk assessment for personal exposure to
   carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in Taiwanese temples. *Chemosphere* 2006, *63* (9), 1610-1619. DOI: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2005.08.051.