

This article was downloaded by:

On: 17 January 2011

Access details: *Access Details: Free Access*

Publisher *Taylor & Francis*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713400837>

The Use of Passive Diffusion Tubes for Measuring Concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide in Air

J. N. Cape^a

^a Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (Edinburgh Research Station), Penicuik, Midlothian, UK

To cite this Article Cape, J. N.(2009) 'The Use of Passive Diffusion Tubes for Measuring Concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide in Air', *Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry*, 39: 4, 289 – 310

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/10408340903001375

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10408340903001375>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

The Use of Passive Diffusion Tubes for Measuring Concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide in Air

J. N. Cape

Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (Edinburgh Research Station), Bush Estate, Penicuik, Midlothian, UK

Passive diffusion tubes have been widely used in Europe for spatial and temporal measurement of NO₂ concentrations. The method is cheap, simple, and provides concentration data in most circumstances that are sufficiently accurate for assessing exposure and compliance with air quality criteria. Tube-type diffusion samplers are prone to several sources of uncertainty, arising from the materials of construction, the absorbent used, the methods of preparation, the details of their deployment (including the exposure time) and the analytical methods used to establish the concentration of nitrite ion absorbed. This review considers the major sources of uncertainty, and reports on the many experiments aimed at identifying and minimizing uncertainties, including modifications to the simple open tube devices that were originally developed in the 1970s.

Keywords Passive sampling, NO₂, nitrogen oxides, triethanolamine, Palmes tube

INTRODUCTION

Since their introduction in the late 1970s for measuring personal exposure to nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) (1), passive diffusion tubes have been used as an inexpensive method for sampling NO₂ concentrations in air over periods from a few days to a few weeks. Their main advantages are the lack of requirement for electrical power, the low cost of the materials, the simplicity of the analytical procedure, and the provision of an absolute air concentration that (in principle) does not require calibration.

The use of passive diffusion tubes for air sampling, in the workplace, in homes, as a personal sampler, or outdoors, is not restricted to NO₂ but has been applied to a wide range of organic and inorganic gases (2–6). For NO₂ the major issues concerning the use of Palmes-type passive diffusion samplers were reviewed over a decade ago (7), and although some of the problems identified have been more fully explored since then (8), there remain several issues that are of concern to regulatory and other agencies who wish a simple, cheap, yet effective method for measuring time-averaged NO₂ concentrations. The state-of-the-art has been briefly reviewed (for the United Kingdom) by the Air Quality Expert Group (9). In Appendix 2 of that report, factors affecting diffusion tube performance are summarized and reviewed, and consequent recommendations for the use of diffusion tubes are made in Section 4.3.2, in particular

the need for specific, validated procedures to control the uncertainties in the measurement methods with the aim of providing long-term average NO₂ concentration data with an uncertainty within $\pm 20\%$.

THEORY

The Palmes diffusion tube for passive sampling of NO₂ was originally developed as a personal monitor for the workplace (1). The principle of operation was described in some detail in the original paper, which noted the assumptions made in calculating the theoretical sampling rate. For a cylindrical tube diameter d and length l , with a perfect sink (absorber) at one end, Fick's law of diffusion can be used to calculate a theoretical sampling rate (rate of net flow of a gas along the tube) as:

$$F = -D \cdot \pi d^2 / 4l,$$

where F is the sampling rate (m³/s) and D is the molecular diffusion coefficient of NO₂ in air (m²/s).

For a given NO₂ concentration of C g/m³, the mass of NO₂ trapped at the (perfect) sink is then $F \cdot C$ g/s (Fig. 1).

The assumptions made in determining a theoretical sampling rate are:

- D is known for NO₂ in air, along with its dependence on temperature, pressure, humidity (i.e., presence of water vapor).
- The absorber is perfect.
- The absorbed gas can be measured quantitatively.
- There is no absorption or adsorption by the tube walls.

Address correspondence to J. N. Cape, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (Edinburgh Research Station), Bush Estate, Penicuik, Midlothian, EH26 0QB, UK. E-mail: jnc@ceh.ac.uk




FIG. 1. Diagram of Palmes-type diffusion sampler.

- No chemical reactions occur in the tube during sampling that would affect the NO_2 concentration.
- The concentration is maintained constant at the entrance to the tube.

If all these assumptions are valid, or are sufficiently good that the error introduced is small, then the geometry of the tube (l and d) gives an absolute sampling rate, i.e., the passive sampler does not require calibration.

Each of these assumptions has to be examined in order to evaluate the conditions under which the passive sampler will provide a reliable long-term average estimate of the air concentration of NO_2 .

The Coefficient of Molecular Diffusion, D

In the original paper (1), the diffusion coefficient for NO_2 in air was given as:

$$D = 0.001858T^{1.5}[(M_1 + M_2)/M_1M_2]^{0.5}/P\sigma_{12}^2\Omega_D,$$

where M_1 and M_2 are the molecular masses of gases 1 and 2, σ_{12} is the Lennard-Jones force constant for the mixture, and Ω_D is the collision integral.

This gave a value for D of $1.54 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ at 21.1°C (70°F) and 1 atm pressure.

More recently, the molecular diffusion coefficient of NO_2 (and other gases) has been reviewed (10). The value for NO_2 has never been directly measured, partly because of its dimerization to N_2O_4 (important at higher concentrations than found in ambient air). The preferred value for NO_2 in air, with an uncertainty of $\pm 10\%$, is $1.36 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ at 0°C and 1 atm. Correcting to 21.1°C using the temperature factor $(T/T_0)^{1.81}$ as recommended by Massman (10), rather than using the exponent of 1.5 used by Palmes et al. (1), gives a value for D_{294} of $1.56 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ (cf. $1.54 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$).

The effects of water vapor in the atmosphere on the diffusion of NO_2 is negligible (7).

The temperature dependence of D varies as $(T/T_0)^{1.81}$, implying a fairly large variation with temperature. However, the mass (g) of NO_2 collected by the sampler depends on the product of D and the gas concentration in air (g/m^3). For a given mixing ratio (partial pressure) of NO_2 in air, the mass per unit

volume changes as T^{-1} , so if monitoring results are expressed as a mixing ratio (ppbV) then the temperature dependence varies as $(T/T_0)^{0.81}$, equivalent to a 3% change in D per 10°C change in temperature at $T = 15^\circ\text{C}$.

For a typical "Palmes" tube of length 71 mm and internal diameter 9.5 mm, the sampling rate corresponds to $0.92 \text{ cm}^3/\text{min}$ ($55 \text{ cm}^3/\text{h}$) at 21°C .

Attempts to calculate the sampling rate from first principles, while instructive in terms of the relative concentrations along the sampling tube, have not reproduced either the theoretical or measured sampling rates (11), but have been used to estimate that an NO_2 molecule spends about 27 s in the tube prior to capture by the sorbent (12). This time is shorter than the residence time calculated from the diffusion coefficient (D) of 2.8 min (168 s) (13).

The Absorber is Perfect

Consideration of triethanolamine as an absorbent is dealt with in detail in the section entitled The Role of the Absorbent Medium and Subsequent Analysis of Trapped NO_2 , but there is no evidence to suggest anything other than 100% efficiency except at very low temperatures or humidities.

The Absorbed Gas Can be Measured Quantitatively

This assumption is discussed in detail in Section 4, and relies on knowledge (or assumptions) about the chemical reactions occurring in the absorption process, and the possibility of chemical changes in the trapped material during sampling and/or storage prior to analysis. Interference from gases other than NO_2 is discussed in Section 4.2.

There is no Absorption or Adsorption by the Tube Walls

One early study in a chamber experiment (14) observed sampling rates that were lower than the theoretical rates, and increasing blank levels with increasing storage time of prepared tubes. The author ascribed these results to adsorption of NO_2 on the acrylic walls; desorption from the walls of previously exposed tubes during storage was postulated to have caused the increase in blank levels. Soaking the tubes in 1M NaOH prior to use led to no increase in blank levels on storage, but loss of 70% of the expected NO_2 on exposure in a laboratory chamber, presumably because of adsorption on the cleaned (and possibly activated) walls. Stainless steel tubes were suggested as alternatives, but these gave a consistent unexplained high bias. Solubility of NO_2 in the plastic used to construct the sampling tubes was suggested as a source of contamination of blank tubes (15). Long-term (week or more) exposure in the field is likely to show little net effect of transient adsorption and desorption from walls provided that the walls themselves have not been "activated" as above. However, desorption may be a source of noise for blank tubes, leading to uncertainty under conditions when very low ambient concentrations are being measured.

A different approach (16) used polythene tubes, which were

cut into pieces after exposure, or disassembled, before extraction and analysis. Less than 5% of the total trapped NO_2 was found on the tube walls (unlike SO_2 or NO_3^- , which showed significant adsorption on the walls), 80% was found on the triethanolamine-coated grids, and 15% in or on the cap. It is possible that some of the NO_3^- found on the tube walls could have come from oxidation *in situ* of adsorbed NO_2 , but was ascribed to capture of fine NO_3^- particles and/or nitric acid.

No Chemical Reactions Occur in the Tube that Would Affect the NO_2 Concentration During Sampling

The possibility of chemical reaction in the tube during sampling was first addressed as early as 1986 (17), but dismissed as likely to be small. The most likely interfering reaction is between NO and O_3 to give NO_2 . In the atmosphere in daylight a balance is set up between the reaction of NO with O_3 to produce NO_2 and the photolysis of NO_2 in UV light to give NO and O_3 . This “photostationary equilibrium” is in fact rarely at equilibrium in the dynamic atmosphere of a city, or in cloudy weather where sunlight intensity changes on a timescale of minutes. Within an acrylic tube (the standard Palmes design) UV light levels are greatly attenuated (13) so that the “equilibrium” is disturbed; NO_2 is not photolyzed, but NO continues to react with O_3 within the tube. This becomes important because the time scale of residence of molecules in the sampling tube (minutes) is the same as for the reaction between NO and O_3 at typical concentrations. If one considers only the lack of photolysis, then this effect is rather small (17,18). However, in urban areas close to emissions of NO , air entering the tube is rarely at photochemical equilibrium because of the need for polluted air to be mixed with ozone-rich air before NO_2 can be formed. Explicit consideration of the disequilibrium close to sources of NO leads to modeled estimates of “over-reading” compared with continuous analyzers that are much greater (up to 40%) (13). This non-equilibrium model has been shown to provide excellent agreement with comparisons of diffusion tubes and continuous analyzers in cities, close to NO sources (19), and is a major source of uncertainty in the use of passive diffusion tubes of the Palmes design close to roads. The greatest uncertainty was shown to occur when NO_2 makes up 50% of the total NO_x concentration.

In field studies, the use of tubes of different lengths has also indicated the role of within-tube chemistry. Effective sampling rates (corrected for tube length) should be the same for all tube lengths—within-tube chemistry would be expected to increase the effective sampling rate with length because of increased residence time in the tube, and this has been observed (20). The effect of wind speed on different lengths of tube would be to decrease the relative sampling rate as tube length increased (see below, Section 3.1). Further experiments, using quartz and acrylic tubes of different lengths (21) demonstrated the importance of within-tube chemistry to the effective sampling rate; quartz tubes, which transmit UV light and permit NO_2 photolysis during sampling, gave significantly smaller concentrations

than acrylic tubes of the same length, and were in much better agreement with co-located automatic samplers.

Badge-type samplers, with much shorter diffusion path lengths, do not suffer from this artefact because the residence time of molecules within the tube is much shorter, but they are subject to other sampling problems, as discussed below (Section 2.6).

The Concentration is Maintained Constant at the Entrance to the Tube

This assumption covers two types of variation: systematic depletion of NO_2 concentrations caused by uptake within the tube, and the departure from steady-state conditions (under which the theory was developed) in the real atmosphere. Depletion caused by uptake within the tube is not important for the Palmes design of sampler; the depth of the depleted boundary layer at the entrance to the tube has been calculated as <1.5 mm at wind speeds of >0.6 m/s (22). Badge-type samplers with much faster sampling rates (shorter diffusion distances) have much greater uncertainties, because the depleted zone at the entrance to the tube is deeper and more dependent on wind speed, and this depth is a much greater proportion of the diffusion length within the sampler.

The assumptions made in deriving the theoretical sampling rate (of constant concentration at the entry to the tube) have been shown to be valid (23) provided that the characteristic fluctuation time is 40% longer than the residence time in the tube (2.8 min for NO_2 (13)). This may not hold for kerb-side sampling. In the simplest case, where there is no chemical reaction in the tube, application of a sinusoidal variation in external concentrations changed the theoretical sampling rate by less than 1% unless peak concentrations lasted less than 25 minutes, when a 5% greater sampling rate was predicted. A typical worst-case scenario was predicted to have a bias of around +2% over 2 weeks (24).

The uncertainty in the effective tube length caused by wind-induced turbulence has been explored in some detail; the results are described below (Section 3.1).

Conclusions

Most of the original assumptions are met in practice to within a few percent, except under certain well-defined conditions. The major exception is the assumption of no chemical reaction within the tube during sampling, which in turn is influenced by the assumption of constant concentrations at the entrance to the tube. This assumption can lead to systematic positive bias (over-read) of up to 40% in conditions where NO and O_3 concentrations are not in equilibrium, i.e., close to dynamic sources of NO , such as at kerb sides or in street canyons.

THE ROLE OF METEOROLOGICAL CONDITIONS DURING SAMPLING

Windspeed

The original design (1) was tested for the effects of wind speed in the laboratory using tubes set at five angles and five distances along a rotating rod, to give exposures in the range 103–515 ft/min (0.52–2.62 m/s). The experiments were done using water vapor rather than NO₂. As expected, higher wind speeds led to higher sampling rates, with the smallest increase in tubes at 180° to the wind direction (away from the wind); those mounted at right angles gave sampling rates that were higher than in still air by 6–20%. Over all angles, the average sampling rate increased by 3% for an increase in wind speed of 0.05 m/s (25). More recent chamber studies showed a dependence on wind speed (Ws) represented by:

$$\text{sampling rate (cm}^3/\text{h)} = -11 Ws^2 + 54Ws + 63.6,$$

where Ws is in the range 0.1 to 2.5 m/s,

compared with a theoretical sampling rate of 72.8 cm³/h for the conditions used (26). This is equivalent to an increase in sampling rate of 104% between 0 and 2.5 m/s. The effect of wind speed on sampling rate has also been quantified in a laboratory factorial experiment looking at the effects of wind speed (0.8 or 3.6 m/s), temperature and humidity on sampling rate (27). The best fit to the data was given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sampling rate (ng/ppb/min)} \\ = 7.40 \times 10^{-4} + 5.81 \times 10^{-4} Ws \text{ (m/s)} + 2.72 \\ \times 10^{-5} T(^{\circ}\text{C}) + 1.43 \times 10^{-5} RH (\%). \end{aligned}$$

For conditions of 20°C and 75% relative humidity (RH), this is equivalent to an increase in sampling rate from 0.0024 to 0.0038 ng/ppb/min (or 60%) between 0 and 2.5 m/s.

Exposure of tubes of different lengths (35, 50 and 71 mm) to NO₂ over 4 days in a wind tunnel at different angles to the air flow, at wind speeds up to 12 m/s, showed that the effective reduction in tube length was around 10 mm at 1.5 m/s rising to 30 mm at 12 m/s (28). These results showed that the effective shortening of the tube was the same, irrespective of tube length, and therefore attributable to turbulence around the tube entrance. The effect was greater for tubes mounted at 75° to the flow than perpendicular to the flow. More recently, laboratory experiments have shown measured concentrations increasing slightly with increasing wind speed (29). The use of a protective shelter to house replicate diffusion tubes greatly reduced the effects of wind speed (30) in a laboratory experiment at wind speeds up to 4.5 m/s, emphasizing the need to know the actual velocity of the wind (and turbulence conditions) at the entrance to the tube, rather than a measured wind speed at some point near the exposure site.

In the field, the comparison between results obtained using diffusion tubes and using automatic monitors has been evaluated in terms of wind speed measured at the site. However, measurements of wind speed are rarely, if ever, made at the face of the

sample tubes, but at some point (usually unspecified) nearby. Therefore, the relationship (if any) between mean wind speed at a site and effective sampling rate is difficult to discern. Some authors have recognized this problem, and have estimated the wind speed at the height of the samplers from measurements at 10 m (27) in an effort to relate the sampling results to actual wind speeds at the point of sampling.

The use of different tube lengths outdoors (28) showed no effects of mean wind speed in the range 2.3 to 4.5 m/s; tubes of different length (35, 50, 71 mm) gave identical concentrations, implying that the effective sampling lengths were as measured, with no shortening caused by differences in wind speed. A similar experiment was conducted several years later using tubes of six different lengths mounted on a roof (31). The results were noisy (despite a precision for triplicate tubes of 3%) suggesting complex turbulence conditions at that particular (rooftop) site. There was a small but not statistically significant effect of increasing wind speed in the range 2 to 6.5 m/s on sampling rates; all tubes sampled with an effective diffusion length that was on average 18 mm less than the measured tube length. The use of grids with a 2 mm mesh across the tube entrance removed the effects of wind-induced turbulence on the diffusion length, but reduced the overall sampling rate below the theoretical value, so that the sampling rate would have had to be calibrated for quantitative use. In their modelling of the situation, the authors took no account of chemical reactions inside the tube during sampling, which may have affected the apparent sampling rates outdoors. More recent experiments outdoors with tubes of different lengths and of different materials (acrylic vs. quartz) (21) showed no effect of diffusion length for quartz samplers at 120 or 71 mm, implying no effect of wind shortening, although enhanced sampling attributed to wind shortening was observed for the shortest diffusion length (40 mm). The difference between the different tube materials was dependent on tube length. The authors concluded that the main effect of tube length was on chemical processes occurring inside the tube (see above, Section 2.5) rather than on effective sampling rate influenced by wind speed, with the exception of the shortest tube, where interference from the sample holder or length:diameter ratio were suggested as reasons for the apparent breakdown of a simple diffusion process.

Several studies have considered the possible effects of mean wind speed during a sampling period on the comparison between diffusion tube results and an automatic monitor. Atkins et al. (17) saw no effect of wind speed in the range 1.0 to 4.5 m/s for 1 week exposure of Palmes tubes. A similar lack of correlation with wind speed has been reported by other authors for outdoor samplers (21,30), although unsheltered diffusion tubes have shown larger (up to 18%) apparent sampling rates than adjacent sheltered tubes (32,33), which may be an effect of wind speed or turbulence. Similar lower sampling rates in sheltered tubes compared with adjacent unsheltered tubes have been noted in other studies (27). The use of some type of shelter, from rain, direct sunlight and/or wind turbulence, is fairly

commonplace (30,34) although the relative effects of sheltering from direct sunlight and wind have not been explicitly considered. Some authors advise against using a shelter on the grounds that it alters the chemical composition of the sampled air through shading (21).

Effects of wind speed are much more important for badge type samplers with very short diffusion paths. Although this type of sampler gives much faster sampling rates, the use of membranes or grids at the face of the sampler, to minimize effects of wind-induced shortening, means that diffusion (i.e., sampling) rates cannot be deduced from first principles, and each design must be calibrated. Alternatively, samplers of two different lengths must be exposed simultaneously (35). Sampling rates for some designs are dependent on temperature, relative humidity and wind speed (36). The much faster sampling rate also means increased depletion in the air around the face of the sampler if not replenished by external air movement; required wind speeds to prevent depletion are typically at least 0.6 m/s (35,37).

Conclusion

Effects of wind speed or turbulence that are demonstrated in exposure chambers or wind tunnels in the laboratory are not observed under field conditions. This is probably because the turbulence conditions in the laboratory are measured at the mouth of the tube, whereas in the field wind speeds are measured at some distance (horizontally and/or vertically) from the tube opening. Both wind speed and degree of turbulence at the tube entrance may be very different from the reported field measurements, and may be very much smaller than those recorded, especially if tubes are mounted in a shelter. Actual face velocities in the field have not been measured, and are probably not predictable, given the complexity of the air flow around most installations. Several authors note reduced sampling rates when tubes are placed in a shelter compared to non-sheltered tubes exposed nearby—provided this does not lead to local depletion through air stagnation it would appear that routine use of a shelter is likely to lead to a lower risk of positive bias caused by turbulence.

Temperature

The theoretical effects of temperature on sampler performance can be separated into effects on the diffusion coefficient (D), and on the units of gas phase concentration (g/m^3 , which is T dependent, or ppbV , which is not). As shown above (Section 2.1), this leads to a dependence of the sampling rate on $T^{1.81}$ or $T^{0.81}$ for concentrations measured in g/m^3 or ppbV , respectively (10).

However, experimental measurements of sampling rate as a function of temperature have sometimes shown a much greater T dependence. One of the earliest tests of the Palmes design showed a 15% decrease in sampling rate between 27 and 15°C, compared with a theoretical change of <2%. This was ascribed to a phase change from solid to liquid in the absorbent (tri-

ethanolamine) at 21°C (38). However, the role of the melting point of TEA was challenged by a later study (39), which showed that TEA solutions did not freeze, but formed a gel even at temperatures as low as -10°C . The role of triethanolamine (TEA) as an absorbent is discussed below (Section 4.1). The effectiveness of TEA as an absorbent appears to be dependent on humidity, and some of the reported effects of temperature on sampling rate may be confounded by simultaneous changes in absolute humidity (40) leading to low effective sampling rates at low temperatures that are caused by a lack of water vapor rather than low temperatures *per se* (29, 41, 42). One laboratory study (designed to evaluate Palmes tubes for use in Greenland) showed almost constant sampling rates from 20°C down to -8°C , then a linear decrease to around 30% of the constant rate, at -28°C (43). Another laboratory study found no temperature dependence between 5 and 45°C (30), while another study found an effect of extremes of T and relative humidity on sampling rates, and low sampling rates in the field in winter (by comparison with an automatic monitor) (44).

For short path “badge” type samplers the effectiveness of the absorbent may be limited by the rate of diffusion in the liquid phase (45), but this is unlikely to be an issue for the Palmes-type, which has much slower sampling rates. Comparisons of a short path sampler with an active sampler suggest a dependence on T of around 1% per $^\circ\text{C}$ (46). Different designs of sampler have different temperature responses, which must be characterized before they can be used (36).

High temperatures during storage after sampling may also lead to losses or reductions in the apparent sampling rate for NO_2 (47) (see Section 5.2).

Conclusion

The dependence of sampling rate on temperature is small and predictable, except in cold dry air. This deviation from theory is related to the use of TEA as the absorbent and appears to be caused by a lack of sufficient water vapor to ensure quantitative conversion of trapped NO_2 to NO_2^- ions.

Humidity

The effects of humidity on sampling rates appear to be related to the use of TEA as an absorbent for NO_2 , rather than any effect on the diffusion process. Most laboratory studies have used RH as a measure of water vapor concentration, rather than absolute humidity, which may be more important. Early studies showed no effect of RH on a short path sampler between 20 and 60% at room temperature (48). This was confirmed by subsequent studies with RH > 20% at ambient temperatures (30,49). Studies with Palmes tubes between 5 and 85% RH at room temperatures (above 22°C) showed a weak linear dependence of the sampling rate (expressed as changes in the diffusion coefficient) given by (50):

$$D(\text{m}^2/\text{s}) = 1.20 \times 10^{-5} + 3.8 \times 10^{-8} \text{ RH}(\%)$$




FIG. 2. Variation of sampling rate with temperature (T , °C) and relative humidity (RH, %) based on dependence on $[H_2O]$ [Gerboles et al., (51) — on left] or T and RH [Buzica et al. (27) — on right]. Data are expressed relative to calculated rates at 1 m/s, 20°C and 60% RH so that they can be compared visually.

This is equivalent to an 18% change in uptake rate between 20 and 80% RH.

More recent studies have demonstrated a dependence on absolute humidity, expressed in terms of the uptake rate for a membrane-capped tube (51):

$$\text{Uptake (cm}^3/\text{h)} = 42.9 + 8.9 \ln[H_2O], \text{ where } [H_2O] \text{ is in g/m}^3.$$

This is equivalent to a 23% change in uptake rate between 20 and 80% RH at 20°C.

A small decrease in uptake rate with time over the first week of this experiment was ascribed to loss of H_2O from the absorbent.

Drying induced by lowering the total pressure during sampling also caused reduced sampling efficiency (52). Effects on sampling rate caused by changing pressure (to simulate increasing altitude) would not be expected, based on the theory of diffusional sampling, but observed changes may be attributed to loss of water vapor from the absorbent (TEA), leading to reduced sampling efficiency. This would be consistent with a greater effect of lowering pressure shown using shorter tubes (53), from which water would evaporate more quickly.

The effects of variations in absolute humidity on a short path sampler have also been reported, with significant reductions in uptake at low RH at low temperatures (40,42). More generally, a dependence on RH is an important factor in some passive sampler designs (36).

Effects of humidity on sampler performance in the field have also been noted (30), with uptake rates given by (27):

$$\begin{aligned} U(\text{ng/ppb/min}) = & 7.40 \times 10^{-4} + 2.72 \times 10^{-5} T(^{\circ}\text{C}) \\ & + 1.43 \times 10^{-5} \text{RH}(\%) \\ & + 5.81 \times 10^{-4} W_s (\text{m/s}) \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to a change of 17% in uptake rate between 20 and 80% RH at 20°C and 1 m/s. If the uptake rate is dependent on absolute humidity, the above equation may not present a true picture of the dependence on T and RH, because RH is a function of water vapor concentration (absolute humidity) and

temperature. However, the two equations (one based on $[H_2O]$ and the other on T and RH) provide very similar patterns of variation (Fig. 2).

A similar equation was reported by Plaisance et al. (26) from a chamber study in terms of the deviation in sampling rate from standard conditions (20°C and 50% RH, wind speed 0.54 m/s):

$$\begin{aligned} V_{SR}(\text{m}^3/\text{s}) = & 0.9 + 2.85 \times 10^{-3} T(^{\circ}\text{C}) - 1.62 \times 10^{-4} \text{RH}(\%) \\ & + 4.96 \times 10^{-5} T \cdot \text{RH}. \end{aligned}$$

In comparing results from passive diffusion tubes with those from automatic analyzers, however, it is important to note that automatic NO_2 analyzers also have a dependence on humidity, which may not have been allowed for in comparing the response of diffusion tubes relative to automatic methods. A chemiluminescent NO_x analyzer response typically decreases by 0.5% per $\text{g H}_2\text{O/m}^3$ absolute humidity (26). This is equivalent to a change of 5% between 20 and 80% RH at 20°C.

Conclusion

Humidity is probably the most important environmental variable that affects the performance of passive diffusion samplers using TEA as absorbent. TEA does not perform quantitatively at low humidities (see Section 4.1). The data of Hansen et al. (43) suggest a loss of efficiency below -8°C , equivalent to an air concentration of water vapour of 2.9 g/m^3 (0.35 kPa), or 35% RH at 5°C . At any given temperature the effect of a change in relative humidity between 20 and 80% is to change sampling rates by about $\pm 15\%$ relative to the values at 50% RH. In practice, the dependence on humidity has rarely been tested in the field, and the interaction between humidity and the reaction of TEA with NO_2 has not been investigated systematically.

THE ROLE OF THE ABSORBENT MEDIUM AND SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS OF TRAPPED NO_2

Triethanolamine

Triethanolamine (2,2',2''-nitrilotriethanol ($\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{O})_3\text{N}$, referred to as TEA) is a hygroscopic pale yellow liquid with a

melting point of 21.6°C. It has been used as an absorbent for sampling NO₂ since the 1970s, initially in solution in a bubbler or impinger, or in the solid phase on molecular sieve (54). Its capacity to remove NO₂ from the sampled air is high (90–100%), based on sequential sampling. However, not all of the absorbed NO₂ is necessarily available for chemical analysis as nitrite (NO₂[−]) ion. Several stages in the trapping and analysis process must be identified in order to understand the overall sampling efficiency:

- (1) The capacity to remove NO₂ from a sample air stream, as determined by sequential sampling. This is usually 100% efficient unless high NO₂ concentrations or sampling rates exceed the capacity of the absorbent to react;
- (2) The reaction with TEA to form a product that liberates NO₂[−] ions on addition of water. This reflects the stoichiometry of the reaction to form an adduct, and the subsequent reaction of the adduct with water;
- (3) The losses of trapped NO₂ during and after sampling and before analysis. These may be through thermal decomposition or photolysis (see below, section entitled Tube Storage) but are not likely to be caused by release of NO₂ from the absorbent—application of pressures as low as 0.2 atm led to no losses of trapped NO₂ from TEA (53).

There is some uncertainty as to the overall stoichiometry of the process, with early authors suggesting as low as 67% conversion to NO₂[−], but showing increasing conversion as concentrations decreased, towards 100% conversion at concentrations typical of ambient air (54–56). These studies used the colorimetric diazotisation reaction with sulphanilamide and N-(1-naphthyl)-ethylenediamine (NEDA) to detect the NO₂[−] formed.

The nature of the reaction product, and the conditions under which it forms, appear to be critical. Reacting gram quantities of NO₂ and TEA in aqueous solution gave equimolar amounts of NO₂[−] and TEA-nitrate (i.e., 50% conversion of NO₂ to NO₂[−]) (57). Similar results were obtained by conducting the reaction in dichloromethane as a solvent, with water present in equimolar concentrations. However, reaction of NO₂ with TEA in dry solvent at −5°C gave the nitroso ammonium salt. It was suggested that the reaction proceeded *via* N₂O₄, and that concentrations of NO₂ > 10 ppmV would give 50% conversion.

Subsequent studies showed that the humidity was important in determining the reaction pathway, with a higher fraction of NO₂ converted to NO₂[−] at higher relative humidities (58). The decrease in NO₂[−] production at low RH was ascribed to formation of different products (52). Experiments with TEA supported on silica in a “Sep-pak” used for both active and passive sampling and analyzed by ion chromatography (IC) showed 90% formation of NO₂[−] and 10% formation of NO₃[−], although overall trapping efficiency in this system was only around 90% (59). In a different study using a similar technique the fractions of NO₂[−] and NO₃[−] recovered were 77 and 23%, respectively (60). The use of IC for analysis, while providing information on both NO₂[−]

and NO₃[−], is also subject to problems when using TEA, because of the effects of TEA on eluent pH which can lead to systematic errors in quantifying NO₂[−] and NO₃[−] concentrations (61). In this study, the overall conversion of NO₂ to NO₂[−] was 74%.

The reaction mechanism of NO₂ with TEA has been studied for high NO₂ concentrations (10 ppm) in dry air, and the products formed were identified (after a process of acetylation) as N-nitrosodiethanolamine (Fig. 3) (62). However, TEA nitrate and TEA nitrite were identified as the major reaction products in a subsequent study, with N₂O₄ suggested as the reactive intermediate, yielding an overall stoichiometry of 0.5 for NO₂ → NO₂[−] (63). The role of water in the reaction to produce a stoichiometry of 1 was shown by the production of triethanolamine N-oxide as the major product of reaction of NO₂ with TEA in atmospheric sampling. TEA N-oxide reacts quantitatively to give NO₂[−] ions (64). However, the presence of liquid water in the trapping medium (TEA solution, 2 g/L) appears to result in equimolar production of NO₂[−] and NO₃[−] (65).

Conclusion

The availability of water is crucial to the way in which TEA reacts with NO₂. Too much water (aqueous solution) yields NO₂[−] and NO₃[−] in equal amounts. Absence of water yields N-nitroso DEA and no NO₂[−]. A mole ratio of H₂O:TEA of around 3.6, which is the amount absorbed by TEA in equilibrium with ambient air at 75% RH and 26°C (18 g H₂O/m³) (52) provides 100% conversion of absorbed and reacted NO₂ to NO₂[−]. As noted above (Section 3), the sudden decrease in sampling efficiency below −8°C (43) suggests that a minimum of around 3 g H₂O/m³ is required for TEA to be effective as the absorbent in passive diffusion samplers. This is unlikely to be a problem in UK conditions except in very cold, dry weather.

Interferences

In addition to its reaction with NO₂, TEA also traps and reacts with other molecules to produce NO₂[−] ions on extraction into aqueous solution. The two most important potential positive interferences, apart from the reaction of NO with O₃ during sampling (Section 2.5), are from peroxyacetyl nitrate (PAN) and nitrous acid (HONO). Dosing of TEA absorbent with NO₃[−] ions produces no interference (66). There is a negligible effect of exposure to O₃ alone in the short term; 200 ppbV for 12 h converted <10% of trapped (reacted) NO₂ to NO₃[−] (35); active co-sampling of 130 ppbV O₃ and 10 ppbV NO₂ using TEA on a filter at 50% RH produced no interference (41).

Interference from PAN is important in that PAN is quantitatively converted to NO₂[−] on (naturally alkaline) TEA (60). The reaction of PAN appears to depend on the nature of the substrate on which the TEA is deposited for sampling; TEA on silica removes PAN from air but only gives 67% positive interference (61). TEA-impregnated filters collected PAN, but only 15–25% of the reacted PAN was present as NO₂[−], the remainder being NO₃[−] (41). For Palmes-type samplers, interference from PAN




FIG. 3. Schematic of possible reactions of TEA with NO_2 with different products depending on conditions of reaction. Specific references are: 1) Gold (57); 2) Li et al. (63); 3) Wei et al. (65); 4) Aoyama and Yashiro (62); Brown (2); 5) Glasius et al. (64).

was $<5\%$ (ppbV:ppbV) (67). In practice, interference from PAN is likely to be very small under UK conditions (68), although it could be a significant interference in California (69).

HONO gives 100% interference, producing NO_2^- on reaction with TEA (41). However, HONO concentrations in UK air are small; even in cities they account for only a few percent of NO_2 concentrations (70). Moreover, both PAN and HONO would be measured quantitatively as positive interference by a chemiluminescent NO_x analyzer using thermal conversion of NO_2 (and PAN and HONO) to NO, so would not be identified as a positive interference when passive diffusion tube samplers are compared with continuous automatic samplers.

There are no reports of negative interference on sampling using Palmes tubes with TEA as absorbent, other than the effects of humidity and temperature noted above. However, several authors have reported losses during sampling, especially when comparing integrated sampling over 4 weeks with the sum of 4 sequential 1-week samples. These losses appear to be related to degradation of the trapped NO_2 by UV light (71). Non-blackened short path polythene tubes lost up to 50% of absorbed NO_2 over a month (72). With Palmes-type tubes, losses

of NO_2 over several months, suggesting that the TEA- NO_2 reaction product is degraded, led to the use of an alternative trapping medium (iodide + hydroxide or iodide + arsenite) (73,74). Lower effective sampling rates over 4 weeks compared to 4×1 week, attributed to losses of sampled NO_2 , have been observed using quartz tubes (which transmit UV light) rather than acrylic tubes (which do not) (75).

Conclusion

Positive interference from other pollutant gases is likely to be negligible in UK conditions. However, the effects of sampling duration are important because of losses that occur during sampling, probably caused by photochemical reactions of the trapped NO_2 (TEA-N-oxide) during sampling. These losses become significant over 4 weeks in comparison with 1-week sampling periods.

Ion Chromatography

The original method used by Palmes (1) for measurement of the trapped NO_2^- relied on the colorimetric determination of

NO_2^- using the diazotisation reaction with acidified sulphanilamide and NEDA, with detection and quantification of the pink color produced using photometric absorption spectroscopy at 540 nm. This color reagent had long been used for the quantification of NO_2^- in solution as "Saltzman reagent." The colorimetric method responds only to NO_2^- , and not to NO_3^- . Consequently, any NO_3^- produced during the reaction of NO_2 with TEA would not be registered, leading to the possibility of underestimating NO_2 uptake rates by TEA.

However, several authors have used IC rather than colorimetry to quantify NO_2 uptake. In an early study, uptake of NO_2 by TEA coated onto a molecular sieve was shown to lead to production of both NO_2^- and NO_3^- ions, especially at low relative humidities (58). Similar results were shown for TEA coated onto silica in Sep-pak cartridges, with 90% NO_2^- and 10% NO_3^- formed from NO_2 (59).

The benefit of using IC was recognized over 20 years ago, in terms of a greatly improved limit of detection using Palmes tubes, compared with colorimetric analysis (76). Using gradient elution IC, the limit of detection for Palmes-type tubes was measured as 4 ppbV.h, compared with 33 ppbV.h for a colorimetric method (67). Other authors have shown a 14-fold decrease in the limit of detection (26). Potential problems with TEA affecting eluent pH (and thereby quantification of NO_2^- and NO_3^- ions) in an isocratic system have been noted (61). Many authors only report the NO_2^- concentrations obtained using IC (47,77), so it is not possible to establish whether NO_3^- is formed on exposure to NO_2 . However, one study did note that only NO_2^- concentrations were needed to calculate atmospheric NO_2 concentrations (15).

The technique has also been used for short path samplers with faster sampling rates (35,40,41,78)

Conclusion

The colorimetric method for measuring NO_2^- ions extracted from the samplers is quick, easy, low-cost, and the method of choice for most UK applications. IC might provide additional useful information on the efficiency of the reaction between TEA and NO_2 (from measurements of NO_3^- ions) and provides much lower detection limits if sampling low concentrations.

DIFFUSION TUBE CONSTRUCTION AND USE

Tube Preparation

The preparation of passive sampling tubes of the Palmes design has not been standardized, and different techniques lead to different results. Sampler tube preparation has been identified as the largest source of uncertainty when comparing the use of passive diffusion tubes for NO_2 monitoring by different laboratories (71,79–88).

Several different techniques have been used for loading TEA onto the grids. In the original design (1), three grids were used in each tube, coated in TEA by dipping them into a 50% solution of TEA in acetone. Grids were then dried (acetone allowed to evaporate) on absorbent paper. This gave an average of 0.95 mg TEA per grid. This technique was modified to use a 1:7 v/v

solution of TEA in acetone to avoid blocking the mesh with solid TEA (25). The use of a TEA solution in water, pipetted onto the grids, was introduced a decade later (28), and has been used as a standard method in the UK (39,67). Methanol has also been used as a solvent to pipette aliquots of TEA solution onto grids pre-inserted into tube caps, because of problems with acetone reacting with the acrylic tubes; methanol evaporates more quickly than water (89).

A 33% solution of TEA in acetone was used with a single grid (90) but the authors noted a significant under-reading compared to automatic monitors. It is likely that this was caused by inefficient trapping or saturation of the TEA, because use of a single grid (using 20% TEA in acetone) was shown to give only 50% capture compared with an automatic analyzer, but the use of two grids solved this problem (16). Reports from the UK monitoring network also identified insufficient TEA on the grid as a problem (81).

Different methods of preparation across the UK network were examined in a comparison in 1999 (82). The use of a 50% solution of TEA in water, rather than in acetone, in preparing the grids gave a significantly smaller response (a bias relative to automatic analyzers of -23% cf. $+11\%$ for TEA/acetone), and a much larger variability (2.5 times larger s.d.). A more detailed study (39) used a variety of different preparation techniques, with two grids:

- (1) 50% TEA in acetone, grids dipped (as for original Palmes method)
- (2) 10% TEA in water + a surfactant (Brij 35) pipetted onto grids in tube (30 μL)
- (3) As (2) but with 20% TEA in water (25, 30 and 50 μL aliquots)
- (4) As (2) but with 50% TEA in water (30 and 50 μL aliquots).

The amounts of TEA on both grids were ca. 7 mg for (1), 3 mg for (2), 5 mg for 50 μL of (3) and 25 mg for 50 μL of (4). All amounts were more than adequate on a mole ratio basis for sampling NO_2 over 2 weeks. No effect on sampler performance of aliquot volume of solution (3) was noted. However, use of 50% TEA in water significantly reduced sampler uptake (by ca. 18%) compared with 30% TEA in water. The authors suggested that this may be because of insufficient water availability, but there may also have been an effect of blocking the grids, thereby restricting access of NO_2 molecules (25).

In terms of blanks, a better detection limit (60 ppbV.h) was found for direct pipetting of water rather than for dipping in acetone solution (200 ppbV.h). However, in a more recent study using both 20 and 50% solutions of TEA in either acetone or water, dipping rather than pipetting was shown to lead to greater precision, especially for 50% TEA solutions in either acetone or water, with lower measured values from pipetted samples than dipped samples (91). The precision for pipetted solutions at 50% TEA (whether in water or acetone) was particularly poor. This was ascribed to surface tension effects leading to "creep" of pipetted solution up the walls of the tube, thereby

increasing the effective surface area for capture of NO_2 . In a detailed laboratory study, the use of three meshes evenly coated with 40 μL of a 10% v/v solution of TEA in water (with no surfactant) was optimal in terms of precision (51).

Comparisons of different methods across the UK monitoring network have shown similar results. The use of 50% TEA in acetone gave higher NO_2 values than 10 or 20% TEA in water, which gave higher values than 50% TEA in water (83,84,86–88). A compilation of 23 Local Authority studies in the UK concluded that there was a seasonal bias (relative to automatic analyzers) in the behavior of tubes prepared using TEA+water, but not for tubes using TEA+acetone (79). Their overall conclusion matched the conclusions from the national network comparisons, that the performance of diffusion tubes for monitoring NO_2 depends more on the laboratory used to prepare and analyze the tubes than on any other single factor. The same conclusion was reached following an inter-laboratory comparison in France (80). This study also noted that the commercial supplier of passive diffusion tubes (Gradko International, Winchester, UK) had subtly changed the tube design over a period of years, and that some of the differences noted among laboratories might have come from the (re)use of different designs of tube.

Perhaps the most thorough systematic examination of the different methods of tube preparation, involving 680 duplicated exposures over 146 exposure periods (92), showed that the dipping of grids (rather than manually pipetting a TEA solution) produced greater reproducibility and capture efficiency (expressed as maximized response), regardless of solvent used (acetone, water) or %TEA in solution. If pipetting was used, then a solution of 20% TEA in water produced the best performance.

Both UK and French inter-comparison exercises have shown a gradual improvement over the years in accuracy (compared against automatic analyzers) and a gradual reduction in spread across different laboratories, but the differences among laboratories are still large, with no consensus as to the cause.

Conclusion

There is a clear need for consistency in tube preparation. Problems of reproducibility of the method have been noted in both the UK and in France in inter-lab comparisons. The minimum requirement based on studies to date is that at least two grids should be used to support the TEA absorbent, and the use of 50% solutions of TEA in water should be avoided in favor of weaker solutions, or solutions of TEA in acetone. There is no clear pattern concerning pipetting of the absorbent onto grids pre-inserted into tubes, or dipping grids into a solution before assembling tubes. Different laboratories find one or other method gives smaller variability, probably related to detailed protocols and practice used. It appears, however, that dipping is preferable to manual pipetting of solutions.

Tube Storage

Several authors have been concerned over the long-term stability of prepared tubes prior to exposure, and the effects on

blank concentrations arising from storage. The original paper (1) gives details showing negligible effects on sampling results when samplers were stored at room temperature for up to 39 days before exposure. There was no consistent pattern over time for tubes analyzed after exposure and subsequent storage. Absorption of NO_2 by the plastic walls of the tubes and release after tube preparation, leading to an increase in blank levels during storage, has been noted (14, 15), with blank levels increasing from 7 to 99 ppbV.h over a month. A similar rate of increase (34 ppbV.h per week) was seen independently (67) with acrylic tubes, and greater increases with PTFE tubes. Storage in a freezer prevented the increase, suggesting that the increase was not caused by NO_2 trapped in the plastic caps. However, in remote areas some exposed samples gave lower readings than capped blanks, implying a contribution to capped tubes from material originally present in the tube materials at the time of preparation. No decomposition of TEA in tubes was observed after 6 weeks of storage (39). Storage of prepared tubes in a refrigerator in a plastic container appears to be optimal (51).

Tests of the stability of tubes “spiked” with NO_2^- , capped and exposed outdoors for up to 2 months, or at 4°C in a cold room in the dark showed no loss of NO_2^- (89). It was suggested that the use of a shield to protect the tubes outdoors had protected the tubes from UV light. In contrast, storage of exposed samplers in the light and at room temperature over 2 months significantly reduced the recovery of NO_2^- (47).

Conclusion

Prepared tubes and exposed tubes should be kept in the dark and refrigerated, in sealed containers, before use and after use, before extraction and analysis. In these conditions, storage of up to several months is possible without introduction of large uncertainties, either as variability in the blanks or systematic losses.

Tube Extraction

Trapped NO_2^- has usually been extracted for subsequent analysis using water, or IC eluent. Most often, extraction and colorimetric reaction has been done in the sample tube itself. In the original, and simplest, method (1) the mixed color reagent (acidified sulphanilamide and NEDA) is added directly to the sample tube. It was noted that adding reagents separately can give unreliable results, because if sulphanilamide is added first, the diazotised product is unstable and may decompose before undergoing the color-forming reaction with NEDA. This observation may have been overlooked by subsequent users of Palmes tubes, e.g. (17), because of the convenience of storing the color reagents as two separate solutions (the mixed color reagent gradually discolors), and may be responsible for the (anecdotal) evidence that changing analysts in the same laboratory can give different results (79). Inefficient extraction of NO_2^- prior to chemical analysis was identified as a cause of significant under-reading by diffusion tubes compared with automatic analyzers in the early years of the UK monitoring network (81, 82).

Use of a single laboratory for chemical analysis of exposed tubes greatly improved the variability of the technique. The average bias across the network changed from -11 to $+13\%$ between 1994 and 2001 as a result of improvements in extraction (84).

Conclusion

Care must be taken to ensure adequate extraction of NO_2^- into solution, and freshly-made pre-mixed reagents should be used for colorimetric analysis.

Variations in Tube Design

In addition to the subtle changes in the design and construction of commercially-available Palmes-type diffusion tubes (80), there have been several variations on the basic Palmes design over the past 30 years. Problems associated with NO_2 absorption on the tube walls were addressed using stainless steel (14) but this suggestion does not appear to have been followed up. Other plastics have been investigated; polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) showed larger blanks than acrylic tubes (67), presumably because of greater solubility of NO_2 in the more porous material. Polypropylene (93) and polyethylene (16) have also been used, and quartz tubes have been used to investigate the effects of UV light during and after sampling (75). Completely shaded (foil-wrapped) or blackened tubes have also been used to investigate the effects of light (32,33,75). Different tube designs have been compared in inter-laboratory comparisons under controlled conditions, and large differences in measured NO_2 concentrations were observed, but it is not clear how the differences in tube design affected performance because there were larger differences among tubes supposedly of identical Palmes design than for variations (44).

In one study, TEA on a cellulose filter was used as the trapping medium, and a stainless steel grid was used at the sampler entrance to stop wind incursions, but no indication was given of how this affected sampling rates (93).

In order to restrict ingress of turbulent eddies, which could lead to effective shortening of the diffusion path, several studies have used some form of permeable cover on the face of the tube, ranging from grids (31, 73) to membranes (44, 51, 89, 94). However, it is not easy to estimate how much such "wind barriers" also impede the diffusion process by effectively restricting molecular diffusion across the tube inlet. Consequently, the sampling rate cannot be calculated from first principles. Limited tests with two different meshes of grid and an open sampler showed similar uptake rates indoors, but a marked reduction (almost halving) in sampling rate outdoors, which was similar for both mesh sizes (the coarse mesh had 38% open space, fine had 43% open space) (73).

The use of a membrane gave a consistently smaller measurement compared with standard open tubes (89), but it is not clear whether this was because the membrane prevented wind-induced shortening of the diffusion path, prevented within-tube chemical reaction of NO and O_3 because of reactions on the membrane, prevented loss of water (which may restrict uptake

at low humidities), or simply added to the diffusion resistance for NO_2 molecules. Diffusion, when using a membrane, is controlled by the internal diameter of the tube, rather than by the size of the hole in the cap securing the membrane (51). In a very detailed multi-factorial laboratory experiment with NO_2 in the dark, tubes closed by a 1.2-mm thick PTFE membrane were shown to respond to RH, integrating time and temperature, but only weakly to wind speed (0.8 to 3.6 m/s) or NO_2 concentration (effects $< \pm 2\%$). The effect of temperature was as expected from theory (its effect on the diffusion coefficient of NO_2 in air). After evaluation of the absolute effects of the different factors on uptake rates, a simplified expression was obtained for the membrane-capped tubes (51):

$$\text{Uptake rate (cm}^3/\text{h)} = 42.9 + 8.9 \ln[\text{H}_2\text{O}].$$

The absolute sampling rate is similar to that for a standard Palmes tube (60 cm^3/h at 50% RH and 20°C , cf. 55 cm^3/h for a standard Palmes tube (see above section entitled The Absorber is Perfect). However, the authors do not state the actual dimensions of the tubes used, so it is not possible to compare directly the effect of the membrane on the sampling rate.

There was a small decrease in uptake measured after the first week's exposure, which was attributed to the loss of water vapor from the TEA as noted earlier (39). Field testing showed that the use of the above equation gave results within 25% of those from an automatic sampler, but a better agreement was found using a more complex equation with explicit inclusion of temperature, sampling time, RH and wind speed. No contribution from within-tube chemistry was observed, but would have been likely to be small at the monitoring site, which is remote from sources of NO. This method has been formally demonstrated to be equivalent to the reference method for the 1st European Daughter Directive, an annual limit value of $40 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (95), but does require measurements of the temperature, RH and average wind speed at the sampling location in order to determine the sampling rate.

Conclusion

The use of grids or membranes across the tube entrance would prevent problems associated with turbulence, and may prevent the systematic positive bias caused by chemical reaction of NO with O_3 inside the tube. However, there are no clear data on the effects of such grids or membranes on sampling rates that could be used to assess whether calibration would be required for use in the field. Direct comparisons with automatic analyzers in the field suggest that the results are not significantly less reliable than those obtained using open tubes.

Other Designs of Passive Samplers

Although the above modifications have involved relatively straightforward changes to the basic Palmes design, passive samplers of very different design and sampling rates have also been used to measure NO_2 concentrations in air (96). The more

TABLE 1
Summary of different designs of passive sampler used for measurement of NO₂ [see also (8) and (96)]

Diffusion length	Absorbent for NO ₂	Sampling rate for NO ₂	Membrane	Ref.
n/a	Glass fibre dipped in 9% TEA in acetone	112 cm ³ /min at room temperature	0.8 μm pore size polycarbonate membrane	48
ca. 1 cm (not defined)	Glass fibre with 1.68M TEA in acetone (0.5 mL on 33 mm diameter)	154 cm ³ /min	Diffusion barriers—mesh and perforated discs	78, 104
10 mm	NaI/Na arsenite on paper filter	25 cm ³ /min	PTFE membrane and stainless steel screen	105
7 mm	n/a (toluene)	ca. 70 cm ³ /min	Various stainless steel meshes	37
10 mm	Paper filter with 20% TEA in water (0.1 mL on 25 mm diameter) or SS grids dipped in 10% TEA in acetone	ca. 20 cm ³ /min	Polypropylene fiber	72
10–87 mm	NaI/NaOH in methanol on paper filter	25 cm ³ /min	PTFE membrane and stainless steel screen	20
Cylindrical ca. 4 mm “Radiello”	TEA on cartridge	62 cm ³ /min	Polyethylene membrane	36
60 mm	TEA on plastic membrane	ca. 3 cm ³ /min	Cotton membrane	106
n/a	Proprietary on filter	9.5 cm ³ /min	Diffuser	107
73 mm	TEA	0.83 cm ³ /min	Glass frit, 160–250 μm pore, 3 mm thick	108
39.8 mm	TEA on glass fibre filter	2.5 cm ³ /min	Stainless steel mesh	109
n/a	TEA on paper	16 cm ³ /min	Sintered polyethylene	110

radical changes have involved shortening of the diffusion path, even to the point of a badge-type sampler where the exposed diameter is much greater than the diffusion path length, and a membrane is used to avoid the effects of wind turbulence (much more important for short path lengths). Where experiments involving alternative designs have helped in the evaluation of the many different factors that affect the Palmes design, they have been cited above. Although short path samplers have very much faster sampling rates (e.g., 50 cm³/min rather than 50 cm³/h), and therefore can provide higher time resolution, they do require a degree of turbulence to ensure that air close to the sampler is not depleted in NO₂. This usually requires wind speeds at the sampler face in excess of 0.6 m/s. Examples of different sampler types are shown in Table 1.

VALIDATION OF DIFFUSION TUBE METHODS

The validity of passive diffusion sampling for measuring NO₂ ultimately depends on the precision and accuracy with which laboratory, and especially field, measurements correspond with accepted active measurement techniques or reference concentrations. The reference method for NO₂ is usually the chemiluminescent reaction of NO with O₃, where the NO is generated from NO₂ by thermal catalysis (usually on a molybdenum convertor). Although this is an approved reference method, it is not free from artefacts—as noted above, PAN and HONO would be expected to give 100% positive interferences (97, 98),

and the response of the instrument, usually calibrated in dry air, is dependent on water vapour in the sampled atmosphere (44, 99). Standardized methodologies for conducting laboratory and field validation of passive samplers have been developed (e.g. ³); procedures for comparing NO₂ passive samplers with automated continuous samplers have been developed for use across the European Union (100). For the UK, the need for a validated reference method has already been noted (Section 1 (9)).

Laboratory Comparisons

Experiments in carefully controlled laboratory conditions have been widely used in evaluating the calibration and validation of passive diffusion samplers for NO₂. Factors such as temperature, humidity and wind speed (turbulence) are regulated, at one or more fixed concentrations of NO₂ (measured using an automatic monitor or generated from a known and calibrated source), over a sampling period of up to several days. Measurements are usually made in the dark, and with no other reactive trace gases present. Details of experiments to study effects of humidity and wind speed are given above.

Results are summarized in Table 2 and show the large range of responses that can be obtained if several different laboratories and tube preparation techniques are used, even in well-controlled conditions. Both under-sampling and over-sampling compared with theory are seen.

TABLE 2
Summary of laboratory comparisons of Palmes-type diffusion tubes (DT) for NO₂ with automatic continuous monitors (AM) or known pre-determined NO₂ concentrations

		Comparison R = ratio meas: theory (DT) = a.(AM) + b		Comments	Ref.
		R = 1.0		Range 0–30 ppmh	1
160	Varying RH, 5–85%	R = 0.78 + 0.0025 × RH(%)		Low wind speed “starvation”	50
5–30	Varying RH	DT = 0.70 AM + 3.65		No sig. effect RH	28
100–1100	Varying turbulence	R = 1.0		4 m/s wind increased to R = 1.48	47
180	Varying T	R = 1.0 above −8°C		Decreased < −8°C	43
23–26	21°C, 65–70% RH	R = 0.8–1.4		R depends on tube preparation method	86
41	25°C, 75% RH	R = 1.3–1.8		Palmes tubes only; others used in study	44
22	9°C, 30% RH	R = 0.75–1.06			
36	25°C, 75% RH	R = 0.77–1.29		Several labs and prepn. methods	80
105	20°C, 50% RH	R = 1.0–1.8		Incr. with wind speed 0.2–2.3 m/s	26

Indoor Comparisons

Passive diffusion sampling for NO₂ has been used indoors to investigate effects on human health. Under these conditions, turbulence caused by wind is not a problem—indeed there may be the risk of an effective lengthening of the diffusion path because of depletion of NO₂ near the tube entrance. This is likely to be small for standard Palmes-type tubes, because the sampling rate is slow. Effects of sunlight are also likely to be small indoors, as are reactions between O₃ and NO. There may be co-sampling of HONO from gas-burning stoves and cookers, but any comparison with a chemiluminescent automatic sampler using thermal conversion of NO₂ to NO would include the sum of NO₂ and HONO in both cases. The biggest problems indoors are the lack of turbulent mixing and large spatial variability. Although this makes the use of many low-cost samplers attractive, direct comparison with a single fixed-point automatic monitor becomes more difficult. Results from some indoor comparisons of Palmes-type diffusion tubes with automatic monitors are shown in Table 3.

Outdoor Comparisons

Most of the controlled comparisons of passive diffusion samplers have been against chemiluminescent monitors under field

conditions, with sampling periods of between 1 and 4 weeks. The sampling duration appears to have an effect on the absolute concentrations determined, even in comparisons of identical diffusion tubes co-located and sampled with different frequencies (see above, Section 4.2). For that reason, data on outdoor comparisons are presented in terms of sampling duration in Tables 4–6 and Figures 4–6. It should be borne in mind that the accuracy of automatic monitors for NO₂ has been estimated at ±3.5 ppbV or ±10% (101).

Conclusion

As illustrated in Tables 4–6 and Figures 4–6, there is general good agreement between the concentrations of NO₂ measured using diffusion tubes and concentrations measured using chemiluminescent analyzers under field conditions. However, the data also reflect the large spread of responses found by different authors using slightly different methods under a range of conditions. In general, the degree of positive bias decreases from 1 to 2 week exposures, but there is still a large positive bias shown for some data sets where tubes have been exposed over 4 weeks. It should be noted that some of the data refer to relatively short periods of comparison, whereas others extend over several sites and years, so they should not all be given equal weight.

TABLE 3
Summary of indoor comparisons of Palmes-type diffusion tubes (DT) for NO₂ with automatic continuous monitors (AM)

Comparison R = ratio meas: theory (DT) = a.(AM) + b				
Conc. (ppb)	Conditions		Comments	Ref.
137	5 days	R = 1.06 (kitchen)	Duplicate tubes	111
7		R = 0.85		
7–95	3–12 days in 9 homes	R = 0.7 (bedrooms)	Duplicate Data recalc.	50
		R = 1.3 (kitchens)		

TABLE 4

Summary of outdoor comparisons of Palmes-type diffusion tubes (DT) for NO₂ exposed for 1 week or less with automatic continuous monitors (AM)

Conc. (ppb)	Conditions	Comparison R = ratio meas: theory (DT) = a.(AM) + b	Comments	Ref.
4–60	Rural UK	DT = 0.97 AM + 1.0	No effect of windspeed or T	17
13–38	Netherlands	R = 0.99		50
1–6	Sweden, remote	DT = 1.36 AM – 0.60	Also compared with active TEA and DOAS	67
6–37	Rural Italy, EMEP site	DT = 0.72 AM + 0.5		7
20–47	Urban UK	R = 1.27 ± 0.10 (acrylic tube) R = 1.06 ± 0.09 (quartz tube)	Overread attributed to chemistry in tube	75
12–33	Urban UK	R = 1.24 (range 0.95–1.72)	cf. 2 week and 4 week sampling	19
1–30	Rural & urban UK	DT = 1.39 AM + 2.0	Values < 10 ppb were close to 1:1	89
16–30	Urban UK 12 sites	R range 1.0–1.61	Compilation of local authority data	79
12–40	Roadside UK	R range 0.7–2.0 Mean R = 1.31		112
25	Airport UK	R = 2.0	Limited data set	113
15–50	Edinburgh	R = 1.32 (n = 587) (range 1.18–1.41)	3 sites, 8 prepn methods	91
24–38	US-Mexico urban	DT = 1.62 AM – 22.5 (calc. from data)	4 sites; overread increased with NO ₂ :NO _x ratio	34

TABLE 5

Summary of outdoor comparisons of Palmes-type diffusion tubes (DT) for NO₂ exposed for 2 weeks with automatic continuous monitors (AM)

Conc (ppb)	Conditions	Comparison R = ratio meas: theory (DT) = a.(AM) + b	Comments	Ref
7–28	Rural Italy, EMEP site	DT = 0.80 AM - 1.3		7
10–38	UK Urban background	R = 1.09 ± 0.02 (normal) R = 0.91 ± 0.02 (sheltered)	17 sites, 1 year; no diff. summer/winter	32, 33
18–27 7–22 7–17	Amsterdam Huddersfield Prague	R = 1.16 R = 1.03 R = 0.99	Compared with badge type also. Only one mesh	90
15–29	Urban UK	R = 1.15 (range 0.91–1.47)	cf. 1 week and 4 week sampling	19
18–30	Rome	R range 0.4–1.4	Poor correlation	47
13–50	Urban UK	R range 0.94–1.02 R range 0.76–0.91	20% TEA:water 50% TEA:water	39
15–32	Urban UK	R = 1.16 ± 0.05 (out) R = 1.03 ± 0.06 (in)	Effect of shelter; R decr as NO ₂ incr	21
24–30	Urban UK 5 sites	R range 0.97–1.34	Compilation of local authority data	79
22	Urban, Paris	R range 0.97–1.13	Different laboratories	44
7	Rural, Paris	R range 0.82 – 0.93		
6–26	Urban, Paris	DT = 0.94 AM + 3.0 R = 0.87 (no shield) DT = 0.94 AM – 0.5 R = 0.93 (shielded)	4 sites, 13 months	26
7	Rural Italy	R = 0.74–0.79	Effect of shelter	27
22	Urban Italy	R = 0.92–0.97		
23–29	Urban, Belgium	R = 0.72–0.82	Comparison with different types	114
11–19		R = 0.62–1.0		

TABLE 6

Summary of outdoor comparisons of Palmes-type diffusion tubes (DT) for NO₂ exposed for 4 weeks or more with automatic continuous monitors (AM)

Conc. (ppb)	Conditions	Comparison R = ratio meas: theory (DT) = a.(AM) + b	Comments	Ref.
4–60	Rural and Urban UK Berlin roadside	R = 1.26 Sig. deviation from 1:1 at some sites	Sites mostly sheltered DT suitable for screening	115 29
12–40	UK Urban background	R = 1.08 ± 0.06 (normal) R = 0.90 ± 0.02 (sheltered)	17 sites, 1 year; no diff. summer/winter	32, 33
6–25	Various, 25 sites, Denmark & Italy	DT = 1.13 AM – 3.4	Wind shield used	64
19	Urban background	R = 1.02 (range 0.61–1.58)	38 laboratories Aug–Oct 1998	81
17–28	Urban background	R = 0.93 (range 0.69–1.24)	33 laboratories Aug 1999	82
17–28	Urban UK	R = 1.06 (range 0.88–1.39)	cf. 1 week and 2 week sampling	19
16–53	Suburban and roadside UK	R = 1.36	3 months Sep–Dec	18
	Rural Denmark	DT = 1.15 AM – 0.98 (±0.04) (±0.42)	7 monthly data points	43
20	Urban background	R = 1.18 (range 0.80–1.66)	31 laboratories Oct 2000	83
20	Urban background	R = 1.14 (range 0.53–1.50)	28 laboratories Sep–Oct 2001	84
2–24	Rural & urban UK	DT = 1.41 AM – 1.6	Values <10 ppb were close to 1:1	89
3–22	Rural & urban UK	DT = 1.38 AM – 1.9 (2 month exposure)	Values <10 ppb were close to 1:1	89
11–35	Urban & roadside 16 sites	R range 0.49–0.93 (Gradko) R range 0.62–1.42	Compilation of local authority data	79
20	Motorway UK	R up to 1.4	3-week sampling	77

USE OF PASSIVE DIFFUSION TUBES FOR NO₂ CONCENTRATION MONITORING

Passive diffusion tubes of the Palmes design, and several variants, have been widely used in the United Kingdom and Continental Europe for monitoring the spatial and temporal variations in concentration of NO₂. A summary of published data is given in Table 7. This is a fairly comprehensive list of published results for the UK, with additional references to monitoring elsewhere that is relevant to the use of the technique. It should be noted that there has been extensive use of the Palmes-type tube by local authorities in France, with data published as internal reports or on the web. Only peer-reviewed papers are cited here. Table 7 does not include measurements made specifically as part of method validation—only reports with significant spatial or temporal extent, or with an original application of the technique, are included. The scope of UK Local Authority participation (not necessarily published, or included in Table 7) can be judged by reference to the UK Network Instruction Manual, which lists 50 laboratories (102). New guidance has been provided recently, following an extensive review of passive diffusion tube monitoring in the UK (103). In addition to the studies listed in Table 7, NO₂ concentrations are also measured using

passive diffusion tubes at three sites in the Level II network for Forest Health Monitoring operated by UK Forest Research ([http://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/pdf/Level_II_data_collection.pdf/\\$FILE/Level_II_data_collection.pdf](http://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/pdf/Level_II_data_collection.pdf/$FILE/Level_II_data_collection.pdf)) and at the 10 terrestrial sites of the Environmental Change Network (http://www.ecn.ac.uk/Database/get_sandm.asp?st=T).

CONCLUSIONS

Passive diffusion tubes of the Palmes type have been widely used in the UK and Europe to measure NO₂ concentrations. The method is simple, cheap and easy to use, and is a very useful tool for measuring spatial and temporal variations. However, the absolute concentrations obtained using this method can show large deviations from more expensive automatic methods, particularly in urban areas and close to roads, which is where the use of tubes may be of greatest interest in determining where Air Quality Targets are most likely to be exceeded. Under such conditions, the tubes show a positive bias, and so give a conservative estimate of actual air concentrations, but may provide useful relative values for comparing different locations. The reasons for the positive bias are understood, and relate to inhomogeneities in the sampled air close to sources of NO.




FIG. 4. Field comparisons of NO_2 concentrations measured using passive diffusion tubes exposed for 1 week with concentrations from a chemiluminescent NO_x analyzer (Table 4).

It has also become clear through many investigations and inter-laboratory comparisons that the details of tube construction, assembly, exposure, extraction and analysis play a major role in controlling the variability of the method. Many different variants have been used, and it appears that small changes (for example, in the way in which the absorbent is placed on the supporting grids) can have large systematic effects on the measured concentrations. Although considerable progress has been made in both the UK and France in reducing inter-laboratory variation, it is not clear why large differences still remain.




FIG. 5. Field comparisons of NO_2 concentrations measured using passive diffusion tubes exposed for 2 weeks with concentrations from a chemiluminescent NO_x analyzer (Table 5).




FIG. 6. Field comparisons of NO_2 concentrations measured using passive diffusion tubes exposed for 4 weeks with concentrations from a chemiluminescent NO_x analyzer (Table 6).

Effects of environmental conditions during sampling have been investigated. The effects of temperature on the diffusion of NO_2 molecules are predictable, and affect the sampling rate. These can be corrected for, but only contribute to variations of a few percent. Humidity also affects the response when TEA is used as the absorbent; the dependence is relatively weak at normal ambient UK temperatures, but becomes important when absolute humidities are small, i.e., in cold, dry air, or absolute humidities are very high, i.e., at high temperatures and high relative humidities. The dependence of sampling rate on wind speed and turbulence has been demonstrated unequivocally in the laboratory, leading to increasing positive bias as wind speed increases. However, there is a much less clear response when sampling outdoors; there is no predictable relationship between wind speeds measured at a site and the actual turbulence conditions near the open end of the sampler.

The use of a membrane or an inert grid at the entrance to the tube appears to reduce the effect of turbulence, but may reduce the sampling rate; this might require calibration of the tubes, rather than relying simply on the tube geometry to calculate sampling rates from first principles. However, there are also indications that a membrane at the tube entrance prevents the within-tube reactions of NO with O_3 , which would lead to positive bias at sites close to NO sources. This may be because of the solubility of NO in PTFE, but no study of the phenomenon has been made.

Sampling times vary between a few days up to 2 months. There is a systematic decrease in the effective sampling rate over periods of a week or more. This has masked the positive bias in some of the studies where tubes have been exposed for 4 weeks, leading to better agreement with automatic analyzers than might have been expected. Exposure to light and to high temperatures appear to be responsible.

TABLE 7
Monitoring studies using Palmes-type passive diffusion tubes for the measurement of NO₂ concentrations

First author (year)	Ref.	Comments
United Kingdom		
Colls, 1986	116	Spatial variation within cereal canopy
Longhurst, 1987	117	Greater Manchester, several years, > 14 sites
Laxen, 1987	118	Urban, spatial variation in street canyon
Campbell, 1988	119	Rural UK, 8 sites, 1985–1987
Goldstein, 1979	120	Indoor vs. outdoor, Middlesbrough
Ashenden, 1989	121	Rural Wales, 50 sites, 1986
Bower, 1989	122	Urban UK, 1987
Bower, 1989	123	Urban UK, Jul–Dec 1986, 363 sites
Bower, 1991	124	
Melia, 1978	125	Indoors, gas vs. electric cookers
Hewitt, 1991	126	Lancaster UK, spatial variation
Atkins, 1992	127	W.Europe 1989–1990
Campbell, 1994	115	Urban UK, Jul–Dec 1991, 363 sites
Atkins, 1995	128	Rural UK 24 sites 1987–1990
Ashenden, 1995	129	Rural Wales, 23 sites
Humfrey, 1996	130	Literature review of indoor exposure relative to health, includes world-wide data
Smith, 1997	131	Rural UK, 12 sites
Bell, 1997	132	Rural N. Wales, roadside
Smith, 1997	131	Rural UK, 1995, 12 sites
Kirby, 1998	133	Urban, Cambridge, local variability
Lebret, 2000	134	Huddersfield and 3 other European cities; spatial
Hargreaves, 2000	135	Rothamsted, 13 sites, seasonal/spatial variation
Hughes, 2000	136	Surrey, traffic related, 1993–1999
Stevenson, 2001	137	Urban UK, 1993–1997, 1000 sites
Loader, 2001	87	UK Network data for 2000
Kirby, 2001	21	Cambridge, Norwich and London
Hickman, 2002	112	Motorway (M25), 1998–2001
Loader, 2003	85	UK Network data for 2001
Stevenson, 2003	113	Heathrow Airport, spatial
Cape, 2004	94	Scotland, roadside, 14 sites, membrane
Marner, 2004	77	West Midlands, 10 sites, 1999–2001
Loader, 2004	71	UK Network data for 2002
Barnes, 2005	138	Cornwall, urban, 11 towns
Other countries		
Noy, 1990	139	Personal & indoors; conditional sampling of “peak” conditions
Madany, 1993	140	Bahrain, 1992, 55 sites
Haue-Pedersen, 1993	66	Odense, Denmark; urban
della Massa, 1994	141	Toulouse, France, spatial
Moriske, 1996	29	Berlin, roadside
Shooter, 1997	15	Rural and urban New Zealand
Krochmal, 1997	142	Urban & rural Poland; short path sampler, 147 sites
Perkauskas, 1998	93	Vilnius, Lithuania; urban
Roorda-Knape, 1998	143	Netherlands, urban, motorway
Marcoux, 1998	144	Spatial – Alpine valley, France
Glasius, 1999	64	Funen, Denmark, 43 sites
Hansen, 2001	43	Greenland, 43 sites
Sanz, 2001	145	European Forest Health Monitoring, 230 plots
Gonzales, 2005	34	Urban, US-Mexico border
Baumbach, 2006	146	Cyprus, 250 sites over one year
da Silva, 2006	147	Sao Paulo, Brazil; urban, traffic related, 33 sites

REFERENCES

1. E. D. Palmes, A. F. Gunnison, J. DiMaggio, and C. Tomczyk, Personal sampler for nitrogen dioxide. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 37 (1976):570–577.
2. R. H. Brown, The use of diffusive samplers for monitoring of ambient air. *Pure and Applied Chemistry* 65 (1993):1859–1874.
3. R. H. Brown, R. P. Harvey, C. J. Purnell, and K. J. Saunders, A diffusive sampler evaluation protocol. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 45 (1984):67–75.
4. S. V. Krupa and A. H. Legge, Passive sampling of ambient, gaseous air pollutants: an assessment from an ecological perspective. *Environmental Pollution* 107 (2000):31–45.
5. C. Monn, Exposure assessment of air pollutants: a review on spatial heterogeneity and indoor/outdoor/personal exposure to suspended particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide and ozone. *Atmospheric Environment* 35 (2001):1–32.
6. R. M. Cox, The use of passive sampling to monitor forest exposure to O₃, NO₂ and SO₂: a review and some case studies. *Environmental Pollution* 126 (2003):301–311.
7. M. Gerboles and L. Amantini, *Validation of measurement by NO₂ passive sampler. A comparison with chemiluminescent monitor*, Report TN I/93/107 (Ispra, Italy: JRC Environment Institute, 1993).
8. Y. S. Tang, J. N. Cape, and M. A. Sutton, Development and types of passive samplers for monitoring atmospheric NO₂ and NH₃ concentrations. *The Scientific World* 1 (2001):513–529.
9. AQEG, *Nitrogen dioxide in the United Kingdom*, Report PB 9025 (London: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Scottish Executive, Welsh Assembly Government and Department of the Environment in Northern Ireland, 2004).
10. W. J. Massman, A review of the molecular diffusivities of H₂O, CO₂, CH₄, CO, O₃, SO₂, NH₃, N₂O, NO, and NO₂ in air, O₂ and N₂ near STP. *Atmospheric Environment* 32 (1998):1111–1127.
11. E. D. Palmes, R. M. Burton, K. Ravishankar, and J. J. Solomon, A simple mathematical model for diffusional sampler operation. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 47 (1986):418–420.
12. R. M. Burton, K. Ravishankar, and E. D. Palmes, Convergence to steady-state in a diffusional sampler. *SIAM Review* 30 (1988):482–486.
13. M. R. Heal and J. N. Cape, A numerical evaluation of chemical interferences in the measurement of ambient nitrogen dioxide by passive diffusion samplers. *Atmospheric Environment* 31 (1997):1911–1923.
14. D. P. Miller, Low-level determination of nitrogen dioxide in ambient air using the Palmes tube. *Atmospheric Environment* 22 (1988):945–947.
15. D. Shooter, P. Brimblecombe, J. Shooter, D. Lowe, P. J. Day, and S. Du, Some characteristics and applications of nitrogen dioxide passive samplers. *Environmental Technology* 18 (1997):243–254.
16. A. Kasper-Giebl and H. Puxbaum, Deposition of particulate matter in diffusion tube samplers for the determination of NO₂ and SO₂. *Atmospheric Environment* 33 (1999):1323–1326.
17. D. H. F. Atkins, J. Sandalls, D. V. Law, A. M. Hough, and K. Stevenson, *The measurement of nitrogen dioxide in the outdoor environment using passive diffusion tube samplers*, Report AERE R12133 (Harwell: United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, 1986).
18. T. Bush, M. Jenkin, J. Banham, and A. Loader, *Investigation of NO₂ diffusion tube over-read resulting from reduced photolysis by UV light*, Report AEAT/ENV/R/0562 (Abingdon: AEA Technology, 2001).
19. M. R. Heal, C. Kirby, and J. N. Cape, Systematic biases in measurement of urban nitrogen dioxide using passive diffusion samplers. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 62 (2000):39–54.
20. G. P. Ayers, M. D. Keywood, R. Gillett, P. C. Manins, H. Malfroy, and T. Bardsley, Validation of passive diffusion samplers for SO₂ and NO₂. *Atmospheric Environment* 32 (1998):3587–3592.
21. C. Kirby, Fox, M., Waterhouse, J. and Drye, T., Influence of environmental parameters on the accuracy of nitrogen dioxide passive diffusion tubes for ambient measurement. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 3 (2001):150–158.
22. P. Hofschreuder, W. van der Meulen, P. Heeres, and S. Slanina, The influence of geometry and draught shields on the performance of passive samplers. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 1 (1999):143–147.
23. H. Hori and I. Tanaka, Response characteristics of the diffusive sampler at fluctuating vapor concentrations. *American Institute of Hygiene Association Journal* 54 (1993):95–101.
24. H. Plaisance, Response of a Palmes tube at various fluctuations of concentration in ambient air. *Atmospheric Environment* 38 (2004):6115–6120.
25. E. D. Palmes and C. Tomczyk, Personal sampler for NO_x. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 40 (1979):588–591.
26. H. Plaisance, A. Piechocki-Minguy, S. Garcia-Fouque, and J. C. Galloo, Influence of meteorological factors on the NO₂ measurements by passive diffusion tube. *Atmospheric Environment* 38 (2004):573–580.
27. D. Buzica, M. Gerboles, L. Amantini, P. P. Ballesta, and E. De Saeger, Modelling of the uptake rate of the nitrogen dioxide Palmes diffusive sampler based on the effect of environmental factors. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 7 (2005):169–174.
28. K. J. Hargreaves, *The development and application of diffusion tubes for air pollution measurements*, PhD Thesis (University of Nottingham, 1989).
29. H. J. Moriske, M. Schöndube, G. Ebert, G. Menk, B. Seifert, and H. J. Abraham, Measurements of NO₂ concentrations in the air using passive Palmes samplers. 2. Field studies. *Gefahrstoffe Reinhaltung Der Luft* 56 (1996):161–164.
30. M. Hangartner, Influence of meteorological factors on the performance of diffusive samplers, in *Measuring Air Pollutants by Diffusive Sampling* Vol. EUR 20242 EN, ed. R. H. Brown, T. L. Hafkenscheid, K. J. Saunders, A. Borowiak, and E. De Saeger (Ispra, Italy: European Commission Joint Research Centre, 2001), 78–83.
31. A. J. Gair and S. A. Penkett, The effects of wind speed and turbulence on the performance of diffusion tube samplers. *Atmospheric Environment* 29 (1995):2529–2533.
32. S. Smith, T. Bush, K. Stevenson, and S. Moorcroft, *Validation of nitrogen dioxide diffusion tube methodology*, Report SSE/AQ/0209 (Croydon: Stanger Science & Environment, 1998).
33. T. Bush, S. Smith, K. Stevenson, and S. Moorcroft, Validation of nitrogen dioxide diffusion tube methodology in the UK. *Atmospheric Environment* 35 (2001):289–296.

34. M. Gonzales, C. Qualls, E. Hudgens, and L. Neas, Characterization of a spatial gradient of nitrogen dioxide across a United States-Mexico border city during winter. *Science of the Total Environment* 337 (2005):163–173.
35. F. de Santis, I. Allegrini, M. C. Fazio, D. Pasella, and R. Piredda, Development of a passive sampling technique for the determination of nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide in ambient air. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 346 (1997):127–134.
36. M. Gerboles, F. Detimmerman, L. Amantini, and E. de Saeger, Validation of Radiello diffusive sampler for monitoring NO₂ in ambient air, Report EUR 19593 EN (Ispra, Italy: JRC Environment Centre, 2000).
37. P. P. Ballesta, E. G. Ferradas, and A. M. Aznar, Effects of the diffusion membrane on passive sampling. *Environmental Science & Technology* 27 (1993):2031–2034.
38. J. R. Girman, A. T. Hodgson, B. K. Robison, and G. W. Traynor, Laboratory studies of the temperature dependence of the Palmes NO₂ passive sampler, Report LBL-16302 (Berkeley: Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, 1983).
39. C. Kirby, M. Fox, and J. Waterhouse, Reliability of nitrogen dioxide passive diffusion tubes for ambient measurement: in situ properties of the triethanolamine absorbent. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 2 (2000):307–312.
40. D. J. Moschandreas, S. M. Relwani, K. C. Taylor, and J. D. Mulik, A laboratory evaluation of a nitrogen dioxide personal sampling device. *Atmospheric Environment. Part A. General Topics* 24 (1990):2807–2811.
41. J. E. Sickles, P. M. Grohse, L. L. Hodson, C. A. Salmons, K. W. Cox, A. R. Turner, and E. D. Estes, Development of a method for the sampling and analysis of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide from ambient air. *Analytical Chemistry* 62 (1990):338–346.
42. H. Tang, T. Lau, B. Brassard, and W. Cool, A new all-season passive sampling system for monitoring NO₂ in air. *Field Analytical Chemistry and Technology* 3 (1999):338–345.
43. T. S. Hansen, M. Kruse, H. Nissen, M. Glasius, and C. Lohse, Measurements of nitrogen dioxide in Greenland using Palmes diffusion tubes. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 3 (2001):139–145.
44. D. Buzica, M. Gerboles, and L. Amantini, Laboratory and Field Inter-comparisons of NO₂ Diffusive Samplers, Report EUR 20860 EN (Ispra, Italy: Institute for Environment and Sustainability, Emissions and Health Unit, 2003).
45. D. Krochmal and L. Górski, Determination of nitrogen dioxide in ambient air by use of passive sampling technique and triethanolamine as absorbent. *Environmental Science & Technology* 25 (1991):531–535.
46. E. Yamada, M. Kimura, K. Tomozawa, and Y. Fuse, Simple analysis of atmospheric NO₂, SO₂, and O₃ in mountains by using passive samplers. *Environmental Science and Technology* 33 (1999):4141–4145.
47. F. de Santis, A. Fino, S. Tiwari, C. Vazzana, and I. Allegrini, A performance evaluation of the open tube diffusion sampler (Palmes sampler) for monitoring nitrogen dioxide, in *Air Pollution VIII*, ed. J. W. S. Longhurst, C. A. Brebbia, and H. Power (Southampton: WITPress, 2000), 421–429.
48. B. C. Cadoff and J. Hodgeson, Passive sampler for ambient levels of nitrogen dioxide. *Analytical Chemistry* 55 (1983):2083–2085.
49. A. Hagenbjörk-Gustafsson, R. Lindahl, J.-O. Levin, and D. Karlsson, Validation of a diffusive sampler for NO₂. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 1 (1999):349–352.
50. J. S. M. Boleij, E. Lebreit, F. Hoek, D. Noy, and B. Brunekreef, The use of Palmes diffusion tubes for measuring NO₂ in homes. *Atmospheric Environment* 20 (1986):597–600.
51. M. Gerboles, D. Buzica, and L. Amantini, Modification of the Palmes diffusion tube and semi-empirical modelling of the uptake rate for monitoring nitrogen dioxide. *Atmospheric Environment* 39 (2005):2579–2592.
52. E. D. Palmes and E. R. Johnson, Explanation of pressure effects on a nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) sampler. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 48 (1987):73–76.
53. R. H. Lindenboom and E. D. Palmes, Effect of reduced atmospheric pressure on a diffusional sampler. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 44 (1983):105–108.
54. J. H. Blacker, Triethanolamine for collecting nitrogen dioxide in the TLV range. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* 34 (1973):390–395.
55. H. Crecelius and W. Forweg, Investigations of the “Saltzman Factor”. *Staub - Reinhalt. Luft* 30 (1970):23.
56. D. A. Levaggi, W. Siu, and M. Feldstein, A new method for measuring average 24-hour nitrogen dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere. *Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association* 23 (1973):30–33.
57. A. Gold, Stoichiometry of nitrogen dioxide determination in triethanolamine trapping solution. *Analytical Chemistry* 49 (1977):1448–1450.
58. D. V. Vinjamoori and C.-S. Ling, Personal monitoring method for nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide with solid sorbent sampling and ion chromatographic determination. *Analytical Chemistry* 53 (1981):1689–1691.
59. Y. Nishikawa, K. Taguchi, Y. Tsujino, and K. Kuwata, Ion chromatographic determination of nitrogen dioxide in the atmosphere by using a triethanolamine-coated cartridge. *Journal of Chromatography* 370 (1986):121–129.
60. M. W. M. Hisham and D. Grosjean, Sampling of atmospheric nitrogen dioxide using triethanolamine: Interference from peroxyacetyl nitrate. *Atmospheric Environment. Part A. General Topics* 24 (1990):2523–2525.
61. K. J. Hedley, P. B. Shepson, L. A. Barrie, J. W. Bottenheim, D. C. Mactavish, K. G. Anlauf, and G. I. Mackay, An Evaluation of Integrating Techniques for Measuring Atmospheric Nitrogen Dioxide. *International Journal of Environmental Analytical Chemistry* 54 (1994):167–181.
62. T. Aoyama and T. Yashiro, Analytical study of low-concentration gases IV. Investigation of the reaction by trapping nitrogen dioxide in air using the triethanolamine method. *Journal of Chromatography* 265 (1983):69–78.
63. M. Li, X. X. Zhang, L. M. Ying, and X. S. Zhao, Reaction mechanism of NO₂ determination by the TEA method. *Chemical Journal of Chinese Universities-Chinese* 20 (1999):1940–1944.
64. M. Glasius, M. F. Carlsen, T. S. Hansen, and C. Lohse, Measurements of nitrogen dioxide on Funen using diffusion tubes. *Atmospheric Environment* 33 (1999):1177–1185.
65. Y. Wei, M. Oshima, J. Simon, and S. Motomizu, The application of the chromatomembrane cell for the absorptive sampling of

- nitrogen dioxide followed by continuous determination of nitrite using a micro-flow injection system. *Talanta* 57 (2002):355–364.
66. U. Haue-Pedersen, C. L. Hansen, K. U. Knudsen, H. Skov, and C. Lohse, Measurements of NO₂ by passive sampling, in *Physico-chemical behaviour of atmospheric pollutants*, Vol. 2, ed. G. Angeletti and G. Restelli (Brussels: European Commission, 1993), 737–743.
 67. A. J. Gair, S. A. Penkett, and P. Oyola, Development of a simple passive technique for the determination of nitrogen dioxide in remote continental locations. *Atmospheric Environment Part a-General Topics* 25 (1991):1927–1939.
 68. G. G. McFadyen and J. N. Cape, Peroxyacetyl nitrate in eastern Scotland. *Science of the Total Environment* 337 (2005):213–222.
 69. D. Grosjean, Ambient PAN and PPN in southern California from 1960 to the SCOS97-NARSTO. *Atmospheric Environment* 37 (2003): S221–S238.
 70. G. Martinez-Villa, K. C. Clemishaw, and A. R. W. Marsh, in *Workshop on Traffic Emissions, Roadway and Tunnel Studies*, Vienna University of Technology, 2000.
 71. A. Loader, D. Mooney, and T. Bush, *UK Nitrogen Dioxide Network 2002*, Report (Culham: AEA Technology, 2004).
 72. D. Krochmal and A. Kalina, A method of nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide determination in ambient air by use of passive samplers and ion chromatography. *Atmospheric Environment* 31 (1997):3473–3479.
 73. M. Ferm and P.-A. Svanberg, Cost-efficient techniques for urban- and background measurements of SO₂ and NO₂. *Atmospheric Environment* 32 (1998):1377–1381.
 74. O. Røyset, Comparison of passive and active sampling methods for the determination of nitrogen dioxide in urban air. *Fresenius Journal of Analytical Chemistry* 360 (1998):69–73.
 75. M. R. Heal, M. A. O'Donoghue, and J. N. Cape, Overestimation of urban nitrogen dioxide by passive diffusion tubes: a comparative exposure and model study. *Atmospheric Environment* 33 (1999):513–524.
 76. D. P. Miller, Ion chromatographic analysis of Palmes tubes for nitrite. *Atmospheric Environment* 18 (1984):891–892.
 77. B. B. Marnier and R. M. Harrison, A spatially refined monitoring based study of atmospheric nitrogen deposition. *Atmospheric Environment* 38 (2004):5045–5056.
 78. J. D. Mulik, R. G. Lewis, and W. A. McClean, Modification of a high-efficiency passive sampler to determine nitrogen dioxide or formaldehyde in air. *Analytical Chemistry* 61 (1989):187–189.
 79. D. Laxen and P. Wilson, *Compilation of diffusion tube collocation studies carried out by Local Authorities*, Report (Bristol: Air Quality Consultants Ltd., 2002).
 80. M. Gerboles, D. Buzica, and L. Amantini, *Exercices d'intercomparaison pour la mesure du dioxyde d'azote dans l'air ambiant par tubes a diffusion*, Report EUR 20744 FR (Ispra: Joint Research Centre, 2003).
 81. AEATechnology, *Summary results from the UK NO₂ network field intercomparison exercise 1998*, Report (Culham: AEATechnology, 1999).
 82. AEATechnology, *Summary results from the UK NO₂ network field intercomparison exercise 1999*, Report (Culham: AEATechnology, 2000).
 83. AEATechnology, *Summary results from the UK NO₂ network field intercomparison exercise 2000*, Report (Culham: AEATechnology, 2001).
 84. AEATechnology, *Summary results from the UK NO₂ network field intercomparison exercise 2001*, Report (Culham: AEATechnology, 2002).
 85. A. Loader, D. Mooney, and T. Bush, *UK Nitrogen Dioxide Network 2001*, Report (Culham: AEA Technology, 2003).
 86. A. Loader, *Investigation of the effects of preparation technique on performance of nitrogen dioxide diffusion tubes*, Report AEAT/ENV/R/0563 (Abingdon: AEA Technology, 2001).
 87. A. Loader, D. Mooney, and T. Bush, *UK Nitrogen Dioxide Network 2000*, Report (Culham: AEA Technology, 2001).
 88. N. A. Martin, S. A. Dedman, S. Gough, M. Henderson, and B. A. Goody, An international facility for the validation of diffusive and pumped samplers. *VAM Bulletin* 25 (2001):10–13.
 89. Y. S. Tang, N. van Dijk, J. N. Cape, L. Love, R. Storeton-West, and M. A. Sutton, *Test and validation of passive diffusion sampling methods for long-term ambient monitoring of NO₂ and NH₃ concentrations as part of the BIOROVER project: Interim report to SEERAD*, Report (Penicuik: Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, 2002).
 90. H. van Reeuwijk, P. H. Fischer, H. Harssema, D. J. Briggs, K. Smallbone, and E. Lebre, Field comparison of two NO₂ passive samplers to assess spatial variation. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 50 (1998):37–51.
 91. R. P. Hamilton and M. R. Heal, Evaluation of method of preparation of passive diffusion tubes for measurement of ambient nitrogen dioxide. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 6 (2004):12–17.
 92. M. R. Heal, The effect of absorbent grid preparation method on precision and accuracy of ambient nitrogen dioxide measurements using Palmes passive diffusion tubes. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 10 (2008):1363–1369.
 93. D. Perkauskas and A. Mikelinskiene, Evaluation of SO₂ and NO₂ concentration levels in Vilnius (Lithuania) using passive diffusion samplers. *Environmental Pollution* 102 (1998):249–252.
 94. J. N. Cape, Y. S. Tang, N. van Dijk, L. Love, M. A. Sutton, and S. C. F. Palmer, Concentrations of ammonia and nitrogen dioxide at roadside verges, and their contribution to nitrogen deposition. *Environmental Pollution* 132 (2004):469–478.
 95. D. Buzica, M. Gerboles, and H. Plaisance, The equivalence of diffusive samplers to reference methods for monitoring O₃, benzene and NO₂ in ambient air. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 10 (2008):1052–1059.
 96. C. H. Yu, M. T. Morandi, and C. P. Weisel, Passive dosimeters for nitrogen dioxide in personal/indoor air sampling: A review. *Journal of Exposure Science and Environmental Epidemiology* 18 (2008):441–451.
 97. A. M. Winer, J. W. Peters, J. P. Smith, and J. N. Pitts, Response of commercial chemiluminescent NO-NO₂ analyzers to other nitrogen-containing compounds. *Environmental Science & Technology* 8 (1974):1118–1121.
 98. M. J. Navas, A. M. Jimenez, and G. Galan, Air analysis: determination of nitrogen compounds by chemiluminescence. *Atmospheric Environment* 31 (1997):3603–3608.
 99. M. Gerboles, F. Lagler, D. Rembges, and C. Brun, Assessment of uncertainty of NO₂ measurements by the chemiluminescence

- method and discussion of the quality objective of the NO₂ European Directive. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 5 (2003):529–540.
100. P. P. Ballesta, *Demonstration of equivalence of ambient air monitoring methods*, Report (Ispra: EC Joint Research Centre, 2004).
 101. J. S. Bower, G. F. J. Broughton, M. T. Dando, A. J. Lees, K. J. Stevenson, J. E. Lampert, B. P. Sweeney, V. J. Parker, G. S. Driver, C. J. Waddon, and A. J. Wood, Urban NO₂ concentrations in the U.K. in 1987. *Atmospheric Environment. Part B. Urban Atmosphere* 25 (1991):267–283.
 102. T. Bush, D. Mooney, and A. Loader, *UK NO₂ Diffusion Tube Network Instruction Manual* (Culham: AEA Technology plc, 2003).
 103. J. Targa and A. Loader, *Diffusion Tubes for Ambient NO₂ Monitoring: Practical Guidance for Laboratories and Users.*, Report AEAT/ENV/T/2504 (Harwell: AEA Technology, 2008).
 104. R. G. Lewis, J. D. Mulik, R. W. Coutant, G. W. Wooten, and C. R. McMillin, Thermally desorbable passive sampling device for volatile organic chemicals in ambient air. *Analytical Chemistry* 57 (1985):214–219.
 105. M. Ferm, *A sensitive diffusional sampler*, Report L91-172 (Gothenburg, Sweden: IVL, 1991).
 106. W. R. Melchert and A. A. Cardoso, A low-cost passive sampler for monitoring nitrogen dioxide in air. *Quimica Nova* 29 (2006):365–367.
 107. Ogawa, *NO, NO₂, NO_x and SO₂ Sampling Protocol Using The Ogawa Sampler* (<http://www.ogawausa.com/pdfs/pronoxno2so206.pdf>), Report, (2006).
 108. U. Pfeffer, R. Beier, and T. Zang, Measurements of nitrogen dioxide with diffusive samplers at traffic-related sites in North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany). *Gefahrstoffe Reinhaltung Der Luft* 66 (2006):38–44.
 109. O. Ozden and T. Dogeroglu, Field evaluation of a tailor-made new passive sampler for the determination of NO₂ levels in ambient air. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 142 (2008):243–253.
 110. Y. Sekine, S. F. Watts, A. Rendell, and M. Butsugan, Development of highly sensitive passive sampler for nitrogen dioxide using porous polyethylene membrane filter as turbulence limiting diffuser. *Atmospheric Environment* 42 (2008):4079–4088.
 111. A. J. Apling, K. J. Stevenson, B. D. Goldstein, R. J. W. Melia, and D. H. F. Atkins, *Air Pollution in Homes: 2: Validation of Diffusion Tube Measurements of Nitrogen Dioxide*, Report LR 311 (AP) (Stevenage: Warren Spring Laboratory, 1979).
 112. A. J. Hickman, I. S. McCrae, J. Cloke, and G. J. Davies, *Measurements of roadside air pollution dispersion*, Report PR/SE/445/02: TRL Ltd, 2002).
 113. K. Stevenson and T. Clark, *Investigation of Air Pollution from Transport Operations at Heathrow Airport*, Report ED48062/Issue 2 (Culham: netcen, 2003).
 114. W. Swaans, E. Goelen, R. De Fre, E. Damen, P. Van Avermaet, E. Roekens, and V. Keppens, Laboratory and field validation of a combined NO₂-SO₂ Radiello passive sampler. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 9 (2007):1231–1240.
 115. G. W. Campbell, J. R. Stedman, and K. Stevenson, A survey of nitrogen dioxide concentrations in the United Kingdom using diffusion tubes, July–December 1991. *Atmospheric Environment* 28 (1994):477–486.
 116. J. J. Colls, Measurement of nitrogen dioxide profiles by diffusion tubes within a barley canopy. *Atmospheric Environment* 20 (1986):239–242.
 117. J. W. S. Longhurst, D. Lee, D. Gee, and S. Green, *The Greater Manchester deposition survey: a presentation of data from Summer 1986*, Report (Manchester: Acid Rain Information Centre, 1987).
 118. D. Laxen and E. Noordally, Nitrogen dioxide distribution in street canyons. *Atmospheric Environment* 21 (1987):1899–1903.
 119. G. W. Campbell, Measurements of nitrogen dioxide concentrations at rural sites in the United Kingdom using diffusion tubes. *Environmental Pollution* 55 (1988):251–270.
 120. B. D. Goldstein, R. J. W. Melia, S. Chinn, C. V. Florey, D. Clark, and H. H. John, The relation between respiratory illness in primary school children and the use of gas in cooking - II. Factors affecting the nitrogen dioxide levels in the home. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 8 (1979):339–345.
 121. T. W. Ashenden and S. A. Bell, Rural concentrations of nitrogen dioxide pollution throughout Wales. *Environmental Pollution* 58 (1989):179–193.
 122. J. S. Bower, G. F. J. Broughton, M. T. Dando, A. J. Lees, K. J. Stevenson, J. E. Lampert, B. P. Sweeney, V. J. Parker, G. S. Driver, C. J. Waddon, and A. J. Wood, *Monitoring for the European Community nitrogen dioxide directive in the United Kingdom: A review of data for 1987*, Report LR 734 (AP) M (Stevenage: Warren Spring Laboratory, 1989).
 123. J. S. Bower, J. E. Lampert, K. J. Stevenson, D. H. F. Atkins, and D. V. Law, *Results of a national survey of ambient nitrogen dioxide levels in urban areas of the United Kingdom*, Report LR 726 (AP)M (Stevenage: Warren Spring Laboratory, 1989).
 124. J. S. Bower, J. E. Lampert, K. J. Stevenson, D. H. F. Atkins, and D. V. Law, A diffusion tube survey of NO₂ levels in urban areas of the U.K. *Atmospheric Environment. Part B. Urban Atmosphere* 25 (1991):255–265.
 125. R. J. W. Melia, C. Du V. Florey, S. C. Darby, E. D. Palmes, and B. D. Goldstein, Differences in NO₂ levels in kitchens with gas or electric cookers. *Atmospheric Environment* 12 (1978):1379–1381.
 126. C. N. Hewitt, Spatial variations in nitrogen dioxide concentrations in an urban area. *Atmospheric Environment. Part B. Urban Atmosphere* 25 (1991):429–434.
 127. D. H. F. Atkins, M. Gerboles, and I. Quirino, *A survey of nitrogen dioxide in Western Europe*, Report EUR 14862 EN (Ispra: Joint Research Centre, 1992).
 128. D. H. F. Atkins and D. S. Lee, Spatial and temporal variation of rural nitrogen dioxide concentrations across the United Kingdom. *Atmospheric Environment* 29 (1995):223–239.
 129. T. W. Ashenden and C. P. Edge, Increasing Concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide Pollution in Rural Wales. *Environmental Pollution* 87 (1995):11–16.
 130. C. Humfrey, L. Shuker, and P. Harrison, *Indoor Air Quality in the Home: nitrogen dioxide, formaldehyde, volatile organic compounds, house dust mites, fungi and bacteria*, Report (Norwich: Institute for Environment and Health, 1996).
 131. R. I. Smith, J. N. Cape, J. Binnie, T. D. Murray, M. Young, and D. Fowler, Deposition of atmospheric pollutants to the LOIS area. *Science of the Total Environment* 194 (1997):71–85.

132. S. Bell and T. W. Ashenden, Spatial and temporal variation in nitrogen dioxide pollution adjacent to rural roads. *Water, Air and Soil Pollution* 95 (1997):87–98.
133. C. Kirby, A. Greig, and T. Drye, Temporal and Spatial Variations in Nitrogen Dioxide Concentrations Across an Urban Landscape: Cambridge, UK. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 52 (1998):65–82.
134. E. Lebrete, D. Briggs, H. vanReeuwijk, P. Fischer, K. Smallbone, H. Harssema, B. Kriz, P. Gorynski, and P. Elliott, Small area variations in ambient NO₂ concentrations in four European areas. *Atmospheric Environment* 34 (2000):177–185.
135. P. R. Hargreaves, A. Leidi, H. J. Grubb, M. T. Howe, and M. A. Mugglestone, Local and seasonal variations in atmospheric nitrogen dioxide levels at Rothamsted, UK, and relationships with meteorological conditions. *Atmospheric Environment* 34 (2000):843–853.
136. S. J. Hughes, E. E. Hellawell, and G. Strongitharm, Evaluation of traffic related nitrogen dioxide data in Surrey, in *Air Pollution VIII*, ed. J. W. S. Longhurst, C. A. Brebbia, and H. Power (Southampton: WIT Press, 2000), 360–368.
137. K. Stevenson, T. Bush, and D. Mooney, Five years of nitrogen dioxide measurement with diffusion tube samplers at over 1000 sites in the UK. *Atmospheric Environment* 35 (2001):281–287.
138. J. Barnes, B. Parsons, and L. Salter, GIS mapping of nitrogen dioxide diffusion tube monitoring in Cornwall, UK. *Air Pollution XIII* 82 (2005):157–166.
139. D. Noy, B. Brunekreef, J. S. M. Boleij, D. Houthuijs, and R. De Koning, The assessment of personal exposure to nitrogen dioxide in epidemiological studies. *Atmospheric Environment. Part A. General Topics* 24 (1990):2903–2909.
140. I. M. Madany and S. Danish, Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Nitrogen Dioxide Concentrations in a Hot Desert Region. *Atmospheric Environment Part A—General Topics* 27 (1993):2385–2391.
141. J. P. della Massa, M. Gerboles, and M. Payrissat, *Etude de la distribution du dioxyde d'azote dans l'agglomeration Toulousaine par la methode des échantillonneurs passifs*, Report EUR 15567 FR (Luxembourg: European Commission DG XIII, 1994).
142. D. Krochmal and A. Kalina, Measurements of nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide concentrations in urban and rural areas of Poland using a passive sampling method. *Environmental Pollution* 96 (1997):401–407.
143. M. C. Roorda-Knape, N. A. H. Janssen, J. J. de Hartog, P. H. N. van Vliet, H. Harssema, and B. Brunekreef, Air pollution from traffic in city districts near major motorways. *Atmospheric Environment* 32 (1998):1921–1930.
144. N. Marcoux, L. Tessier, and Y. Bégin, Répartition estivale du dioxyde d'azote et de l'ozone dans une vallée alpine, Chamonix, France. *Géographie physique et Quaternaire* 52 (1998): 1–9.
145. M. J. Sanz and G. Krause, in *Measuring Air Pollutants by Diffusive Sampling*, Vol. EUR 20242 EN, R. H. Brown, T. L. Hafkenschied, K. J. Saunders, A. Borowiak, and E. De Saeger, Eds., European Commission Joint research centre, Montpellier, France, 2001, 10–15.
146. G. Baumbach, H. Pfeiffer, L. Sarachaga-Ruiz, S. Kleanthous, O. Poulida, and E. Beyaz, Determination of the spatial air pollutants distribution by combination of diffusive sampling and statistical modelling. *Gefahrstoffe Reinhaltung Der Luft* 66 (2006):54–57.
147. A. S. da Silva, M. R. Cardoso, K. Meliefste, and B. Brunekreef, Use of passive diffusion sampling method for defining NO₂ concentrations gradient in Sao Paulo, Brazil. *Environ Health* 5 (2006):19.