

# Critical review of receptor modelling for particulate matter: A case study of India

Pant, Pallavi; Harrison, Roy

DOI:

[10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.11.060](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.11.060)

## Document Version

Peer reviewed version

## Citation for published version (Harvard):

Pant, P & Harrison, R 2012, 'Critical review of receptor modelling for particulate matter: A case study of India', *Atmospheric Environment*, vol. 49, pp. 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.11.060>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

## Publisher Rights Statement:

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Atmospheric Environment*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Atmospheric Environment* 49 (2012) 1-12 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.11.060>

## General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

## Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

**Critical Review of Receptor Modelling for  
Particulate Matter: A Case Study of India**

**Pallavi Pant and Roy M. Harrison<sup>\*1</sup>**

**Division of Environmental Health & Risk Management,  
School of Geography, Earth & Environmental Sciences  
University of Birmingham, Edgbaston**

**Birmingham B15 2TT  
United Kingdom**

---

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding Author: Tel: 00 44 121 414 3494; Fax: 00 44 121 414 3709;  
Email: r.m.harrison@bham.ac.uk

<sup>1</sup> Also at: Department of Environmental Sciences / Center of Excellence in Environmental Studies, King Abdulaziz University, PO Box 80203, Jeddah, 21589, Saudi Arabia.

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 India is used as a case study in reviewing the application of receptor models for source  
3 apportionment. India has high concentrations of airborne particulate matter, and the  
4 application of effective abatement measures is a high priority, and demands confidence in the  
5 results of source apportionment studies. The many studies conducted are reviewed, and  
6 reveal a very wide range of conclusions, even for the same city. To some degree these  
7 divergences may be the result of using different sampling locations and/or seasons, but to a  
8 large extent differences probably arise from methodological weaknesses. The assignment of  
9 factors from multivariate receptor models to specific source categories is in many cases  
10 highly questionable as factors often include combinations of chemical constituents that are of  
11 low plausibility. This ambiguity in terms of presence of tracer elements may be the result of  
12 genuine collinearity of diverse sources, or more probably arises from methodological  
13 problems. Few studies have used either organic molecular markers or chemical mass balance  
14 (CMB) models, and there is a shortage of data on locally-derived emission source profiles,  
15 although recent work has begun to remedy this weakness. The conclusions include a number  
16 of recommendations for use in design of future studies.

17

18 **Keywords:** Receptor Model; PM; Source Apportionment; Chemical Mass Balance;  
19 Multivariate Models; India

20

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Air quality has been a cause of concern all over the world with the concentrations of criteria  
3 pollutants exceeding the standards at many places, particularly in developing countries.  
4 Particulate matter (PM) has been recognized as one of the key pollutants with a negative  
5 impact on human health, and a range of regulations have been introduced in order to control  
6  $PM_{10}$  levels in urban areas with an increasing focus on  $PM_{2.5}$  control. However, in order to  
7 design effective programmes and strategies for reduction of PM concentration in the ambient  
8 air, it is necessary to have information about the sources and their respective contributions.  
9 The term, source apportionment (SA) describes techniques used to quantify the contribution  
10 of different sources to atmospheric PM concentrations. There is a wide range of published  
11 literature on source apportionment using dispersion models and monitoring data (Laupsa et  
12 al., 2009, Colvile et al., 2003). However, in the Indian context, most of the source  
13 apportionment studies have been conducted using receptor models and hence, receptor  
14 models are the focus of this review. Receptor models form a subset of source apportionment  
15 techniques and apportion the pollutant concentrations based on the measured ambient air data  
16 and the knowledge about composition of the contributing sources (Henry et al., 1984). The  
17 key outputs are the percentage contributions of different sources to pollutant concentration.  
18 Such models are particularly helpful in cases where complete emissions inventories are not  
19 available (Hopke, 1991). Receptor models have been used for identification of sources and  
20 their respective contributions to airborne particulate matter across the world (Harrison et al.,  
21 1997; Kumar et al., 2001; Larsen and Baker, 2003; Begum et al., 2004; Lai et al., 2005; Song  
22 et al., 2006; Tsai and Chen, 2006; Chowdhury et al., 2007; Guo et al., 2009; Kong et al.,  
23 2010; Stone et al., 2010; Gu et al., 2011).

24 Receptor models can be divided into two broad categories: microscopic and chemical.  
25 Microscopic methods, including optical, scanning electron microscope (SEM) and automated  
26 SEM analyses are primarily based on the analysis of morphological features of many  
27 individual particles in the ambient air (Cooper and Watson, 1980). However, they are not  
28 very feasible for large-scale use since they do not produce quantitative results in most cases.  
29 Chemical methods, on the other hand, utilize the chemical composition of airborne particles  
30 for identification and apportionment of sources of PM in the atmosphere. A number of  
31 different models are included in this category such as enrichment factor analysis, times series  
32 analysis, Chemical Mass Balance (CMB) analysis, multivariate factor analysis (including  
33 Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Positive Matrix Factorization (PMF)),

1 UNMIX, species series analysis and Multilinear Engine (ME) analysis (Cooper and Watson,  
2 1980; Henry et al., 1984; Hopke, 1991; Ramadan et al., 2003). Such methods use trace  
3 elements, elemental/ organic carbon and organic molecular markers for identification of  
4 sources and over time have become popular for SA analyses.

5

6 Since PM is composed of both inorganic (trace metals, cations and anions) and organic  
7 species, a range of source markers are used in receptor modelling studies. Traditionally, most  
8 studies were carried out using inorganic trace elements like Fe, Zn, Pb, Cr, Al and Ni.  
9 However, since many of the trace elements are emitted from a range of sources (e.g., Zn is  
10 emitted from tyre wear as well refuse burning), it was difficult to apportion the PM to sources  
11 with a high degree of confidence. Further, with the removal of elements like Pb and Br from  
12 gasoline, there has been a need to develop and use new markers. In the last two decades,  
13 research has focused on the identification and development of organic molecular markers for  
14 SA since they can be characteristic of sources, thus reducing the source ambiguity, and  
15 creating markers for sources which are difficult to be apportioned solely on the basis of  
16 inorganic tracers, e.g., levoglucosan for biomass burning (Harrison et al., 1996; 2003;  
17 Schauer et al., 1996; Robinson et al., 2006).

18

19 The CMB method requires *a priori* knowledge of the composition of all sources contributing  
20 to the airborne pollution, but not their emission rates. The measured air quality is assumed to  
21 be a linear sum of the contributions of the known sources, whose contributions are summed  
22 over each different sampling period to give the best match to the concentrations of the many  
23 chemical species measured in the atmosphere. In more recent studies, organic “molecular  
24 markers” which may be only minor constituents of emissions are measured, as these help to  
25 discriminate between similar sources (e.g. gasoline and diesel engines).

26

27 There is a suite of multivariate statistical methods based upon factor analysis, of which PMF  
28 has been developed specifically for the purpose of source apportionment of air quality data,  
29 and is the most commonly applied. The method requires no *a priori* knowledge of source  
30 composition, but any information on source emissions characteristics is helpful in  
31 discriminating between similar sources. The method requires a substantial number (at least  
32 50) of separate air samples and works best with a large dataset in which the number of  
33 samples far exceeds the number of analytical variables. A minimum variable to case ratio of  
34 1:3 should be maintained in order to obtain accurate results (Thurston and Spengler, 1985).

1 For a clearer distinction, it is better to have short sampling times so that overlap of multiple  
2 point source contributions to a given sample is minimised. The samples are analysed for the  
3 chemical constituents, and those constituents from the same source have the same temporal  
4 variation, and if unique to that source are perfectly correlated. Typically, however, a given  
5 chemical constituent will have multiple sources and the program is able to view correlations  
6 in a multidimensional space and can generate chemical profiles of “factors” with a unique  
7 temporal profile characteristic of a source. Past knowledge of source chemical profiles is  
8 used to assign factors to sources, and typically identification of six or seven different sources  
9 is a good outcome. Before PMF became widely adopted, PCA was widely used for the same  
10 purpose, but is less refined than PMF. Input data plays an important role in the final results,  
11 and care has to be taken to ensure that this is of good quality and where possible uncertainties  
12 can be assigned to individual analytes.

13  
14 The key differences between CMB and the methods based upon multivariate statistics are  
15 summarised in Table 1. Studies have been conducted to compare results from different  
16 models (Larsen and Baker, 2003; Ramadan et al., 2003; Shrivastava et al., 2007; Bullock et  
17 al., 2008; Lee et al., 2008; Viana et al., 2008b; Yatkin and Bayram, 2008; Callén et al., 2009;  
18 Tauler et al., 2009). Multicollinearity can affect the model estimates, particularly in cases  
19 where different sources have similar signatures, although multivariate models help to reduce  
20 that problem substantially (Henry et al., 1984; Thurston and Liroy, 1987). It has been reported  
21 that in cases where two different sources have similar signatures, it becomes difficult to  
22 distinguish between them and neither CMB nor multivariate models can distinguish between  
23 sources with similar signatures when additional information (for e.g., meteorology data) is  
24 missing (Henry et al., 1984).

25  
26 Hybrid models such as target transformation factor analysis (TTFA) and the constrained  
27 physical receptor model (COPREM) have been designed to combine the features of CMB  
28 and factor analysis models with the aim of maximizing the advantages while minimizing the  
29 limitations of each model (Wahlin, 2003; Viana et al., 2008a). The Multilinear Engine (ME)  
30 program also allows the use of source composition data to constrain the model.

31  
32 Larsen and Baker (2003) compared three different multivariate techniques- UNMIX,  
33 PCA/MLR and PMF for SA of ambient polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in Baltimore.

1 Although they reported that PCA/MLR is unable to model extreme data effectively, they  
2 concluded that the overall source contributions compare well among the various models.  
3 They also reported that use of different techniques on the same data set could help in  
4 identification of missing sources, and increase the robustness of the results. Shrivastava et al.  
5 (2007) used PMF and CMB for source apportionment of organic carbon and found good  
6 correlation between individual profiles for CMB and factors identified by PMF but with  
7 systematic biases that were found to be within an acceptable range (a factor of two). Lee et al.  
8 (2008) compared the CMB and the PMF models and concluded that although both models  
9 identify similar sources, they apportion contributions of different sources differently. The  
10 authors suggested that a lack of local source profiles, omission of key sources or lack of  
11 suitable markers, and the different assumptions regarding aging of the source emissions as the  
12 possible causes for the different estimations. Viana et al. (2008b) compared PCA, CMB and  
13 PMF for identification of source contributions to PM<sub>10</sub> in Spain. They reported overall  
14 consistency between the different models with high correlation in terms of source  
15 identification. However, they noted larger differences in terms of the percentage contribution  
16 of various sources. They suggested that a combined approach with the use of multivariate  
17 techniques for identification and interpretation of emissions sources and use of CMB for  
18 source contribution could help in increasing the robustness of the results. Earlier, Thurston  
19 and Lioy (1987) had also suggested a similar approach with the consecutive use of  
20 multivariate and chemical mass balance models to derive better results from receptor  
21 modelling studies. Similarly, Shi et al. (2011) tested a combined two-stage PCA/MLR- CMB  
22 model and found acceptable results using synthetic datasets with collinearity. They also  
23 concluded that maximum uncertainty is generally observed in case of highly collinear  
24 sources.

25  
26 Callén et al. (2009) compared three different multivariate techniques- PCA-ACPS, UNMIX,  
27 PMF for source apportionment of PM<sub>10</sub> and found that the different models showed high  
28 correlation between modelled and measured concentrations and PCA and PMF were able to  
29 identify more sources in comparison with UNMIX with good agreement. Tauler et al. (2009)  
30 compared four different multivariate models (PCA, PMF, Multivariate Curve Resolution by  
31 Alternating Least Squares, (MCR-ALS) and Weighted Alternating Least Squares (MCR-  
32 WALS)) and concluded that PMF and MCR-WALS identify sources and apportion the  
33 emissions to sources in a similar fashion. The weighted models (PMF and MRC-WALS)  
34 were found superior in robust and accurate factor identification.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

Receptor models have been used for regulatory purposes since they were first used in Oregon, USA in the late 1970s (Gordon, 1988). However, there is a caveat regarding the degree of uncertainty associated with the results (Caselli et al., 2006).

### **Air Pollution in India**

Given the rapid rates of urbanization in Indian cities, air pollution is increasingly becoming a critical threat to the environment and to the quality of life among the urban population in India. Air quality has been a cause of concern in Indian cities with the concentrations of criteria pollutants exceeding health-based standards, and PM has been identified as one of the key public health concerns. High enrichment factors have been reported for various metals including Pb, Zn, Cu, Ni and Cr in a number of Indian cities, indicative of anthropogenic sources of heavy metals in particulate matter (Kulshrestha et al., 1995; Pandey et al., 1998; Negi et al., 2002; Rastogi and Sarin, 2009). Also, using SEM-EDX analysis, Srivastava et al. (2009b) reported that particles were primarily of anthropogenic origin irrespective of size range in polluted areas, e.g. traffic intersections. Although there has been an increased focus on PM emission control in recent years, the concentrations are still found to exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) regularly.

The primary sources of air pollution in India have been identified as vehicular emissions, industrial emissions, coal combustion, biomass burning, road dust and refuse burning. There has been a rapid increase in motorization in India in the past years and this has led to an increasing contribution of the transport sector to air pollution in urban areas. Small-scale industries functioning within urban centres have been found to contribute to the air pollution problem.

### **SOURCE APPORTIONMENT AND RECEPTOR MODELLING IN INDIA**

There has not to our knowledge previously been a review of either aerosol source apportionment or receptor modelling work conducted in India. In this article, we seek to review existing knowledge and to make recommendations as to future directions. There is a growing body of literature on source apportionment of PM in India using receptor modelling (Table S1 in Supplementary Information). A majority of the SA studies have been conducted using multivariate methods; PCA being the most commonly used technique although there are some cases of application of the CMB model (Gupta et al., 2007; Srivastava et al., 2009a;

1 Gummeneni et al., 2011). One of the key reasons for use of multivariate models is the  
2 absence of local source profiles, and it is only in the recent times that source profiles have  
3 been generated for some of the sources in India. Most of the studies using CMB have used  
4 the source profiles available through the USEPA Speciate database. Gupta et al. (2007)  
5 prepared soil dust and road dust source profiles for Kolkata, and the recently released Central  
6 Pollution Control Board (CPCB) source apportionment study (CPCB, 2010) also contains  
7 India-specific source profiles for a number of sources. Use of microscopic methods has also  
8 been reported though it has not been widely applied (Negi et al., 1987; Bandhu et al., 2000;  
9 Srivastava et al., 2009b). Enrichment factor analysis has been used in several cases, either in  
10 conjunction with factor analysis or independently (Negi et al., 2002; Shridhar et al., 2010).  
11 One study has been reported using PMF analysis (Bhanuprasad et al., 2008) although it was  
12 conducted at a regional scale (an Indian Ocean cruise) rather than at the city level. There are  
13 only a couple of studies comparing results from different models, and in both cases, a  
14 comparison has been made between the CMB model and multivariate methods (Srivastava et  
15 al., 2008; Srivastava et al., 2009a). Results of both the studies have indicated overall  
16 similarity akin to other studies (Shrivastava et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2008).

17

18 Total suspended particulate matter (TSP) and PM<sub>10</sub> have been studied in great detail due to  
19 concerns over the health impacts but in recent years, the smaller size fractions of particulate  
20 matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> or less) have also gained immense importance given the recent evidence of  
21 their public health implications. However, much of the research is still focused on TSP and  
22 PM<sub>10</sub>, with the exception of a few cases where PM<sub>2.5</sub> (Chowdhury et al., 2007; Tiwari et al.,  
23 2009; Khare and Baruah, 2010; Gummeneni et al., 2011) or PM<sub>1</sub> have been analysed  
24 (Chakrobarty and Gupta, 2010).

25 In terms of geographic distribution across the country, most of the studies have been  
26 conducted in New Delhi (Balachandran et al., 2000; Khillare et al., 2004; Srivastava and Jain,  
27 2007b; Shridhar et al., 2010) followed by Mumbai (Kumar et al., 2001; Chelani et al., 2008;  
28 Kothai et al., 2008) and Kolkata (Gupta et al., 2007; Kar et al., 2010). A few studies have  
29 been conducted in other cities including Kanpur (Chakrobarty and Gupta, 2010), Chandigarh  
30 (Bandhu et al., 2000), Agra (Kulshrestha et al., 2009; Masih et al., 2010), Tirupati (Mouli et  
31 al., 2006) and Hyderabad (Gummeneni et al., 2011). In most of the studies, a range of urban  
32 sampling sites have been used for analysis including residential, commercial, industrial, and  
33 traffic intersections/kerbside. However, there are a limited number of analyses focused on

1 measurement and analysis between urban and background locations (Chowdhury et al., 2007;  
2 Shridhar et al., 2010) where results have indicated significant enrichment of trace metals in  
3 the urban environment. The Central Pollution Control Board report (CPCB, 2010) referred to  
4 in more detail later, is based upon detailed studies conducted in six individual cities.

5 A majority of the PM source apportionment studies have been conducted using trace element  
6 markers (Balachandran et al., 2000; Kumar et al., 2001; Srivastava and Jain, 2007b; Kothai  
7 et al., 2008) and in some cases, inorganic tracers have been used in conjunction with organic  
8 and elemental carbon (Gupta et al., 2007; Tiwari et al., 2009; Chelani et al., 2010). The use of  
9 organic molecular markers for PM source apportionment has only been reported in recent  
10 years (Chowdhury et al., 2007; Masih et al., 2010).

11

## 12 **Source Profiles**

13 One of the most important parameters in the receptor modelling analysis is the selection of  
14 source signature/source profile. Source signature refers to the mix of tracer elements and/or  
15 molecular markers used for identification of sources. A wide range of source signatures have  
16 been used by authors for source identification across the country (Table 2) and the key  
17 markers used in the SA studies conducted in India are more or less similar to the markers  
18 reported/used internationally. These include the use of Al, Si, Ti, Ca etc for crustal/soil  
19 sources, Ni and V for residual/fuel oil combustion, Zn, Cr for refuse burning/incineration and  
20 Zn, Cr, Pb, Cu etc for vehicular emissions (Refer to Table SI for details).

21

22 In terms of harmonizing source profiles for source identification and apportionment, one of  
23 the key considerations is the fact that different researchers have interpreted sources  
24 differently. Based on a review of the available literature, the following key source signature  
25 categories can be classified for emission sources in India:

26 *Crustal re-suspension/soil dust/ road dust:* These are often difficult to separate, particularly  
27 as road dust is often a complex mixture from various anthropogenic and biogenic sources  
28 including vehicular exhaust, coal combustion, soil dust, construction material and industrial  
29 emissions that contribute to its composition through dry deposition (Rogge et al., 1993).  
30 Crustal elements typically used as tracers for soil dust and/or crustal re-suspension include  
31 Al, Si, Ca, Ti, Mg, Fe and Na (Lough et al., 2005; Jaeckels et al., 2007; Begum et al., 2010;  
32 Stone et al., 2010; Yin et al., 2010; Fujiwara et al., 2011; Gu et al., 2011). A whole array of  
33 element tracers has been used in India for identification of this source type including Al, Si,

1 Ca, Ti, Fe, Pb, Cu, Cr, Ni, Co, Mg, and V (Balachandran et al., 2000; Khillare et al., 2004;  
2 Chelani et al., 2008; Chakrobarty and Gupta, 2010; Shridhar et al., 2010; Srimuruganandam  
3 and Nagendra, 2011). Certain of these are rather surprising (eg Ni, Co and V) as their  
4 abundance in soil is low and in vehicles only modest.

5 Elements like scandium (Sc) or Fe are sometimes considered, based on the rock type of the  
6 area under study. For example, in the case of New Delhi, Fe has been used as a marker for  
7 crustal re-suspension by many authors since rock composed of ferrogenous quartzite from the  
8 Aravalli Hills is representative of the source material for soils within Delhi itself. Brake dust  
9 is also a source of Fe (Gietl et al, 2010), potentially leading to confusion of the two sources.

10 Different authors have interpreted the sources of soil/crustal dust, road dust and re-suspended  
11 dust differently, and it is difficult to compare results since the category types are highly  
12 varied. While some authors have reported soil dust and crustal re-suspension due to vehicular  
13 activity as separate sources (Gupta et al., 2007), others have combined the two (Kulshrestha  
14 et al., 2009). In some cases, construction dust has also been included in the crustal source  
15 category. A number of authors have used the assumption that soil dust includes loadings of  
16 metals like Pb, Cr, Ni, Co etc. from various sources due to deposition over time (Bandhu et  
17 al., 2000; Mouli et al., 2006; Srivastava et al., 2007; Chakrobarty and Gupta, 2010), while  
18 other have segregated soil dust and road/ re-suspended dust using the absence/presence of  
19 crustal elements like Ca, Si, Al and metals Zn, Pb and Cr in the source profile (Gupta et al.,  
20 2007; Chowdhury et al., 2007; Kothai et al., 2008; Kulshrestha et al., 2009; Khare and  
21 Baruah, 2010). In some cases, the source identification is ambiguous given the choice of  
22 markers used for the source. For example, Basha et al. (2010) have identified the factor  
23 containing Pb, Cr, Co as soil/ re-suspended dust, and factors containing Cu and Cd as road  
24 dust. Given that there are a number of plausible sources for Pb, Cu, Cr, and Co, it is difficult  
25 to ascertain if the factor actually corresponds to the soil source. Similarly, Mouli et al. (2006)  
26 reported a factor enriched in Mn, Ni, Co, Cu, Pb, Li, V and Cr as a crustal source with  
27 contamination from coal fly ash, and vehicular emissions.

28 The crustal/road dust source has been reported to be a major contributor in the case of Delhi,  
29 with distinct seasonal patterns, where as much as 70 percent of the coarse fraction of PM<sub>10</sub>  
30 (PM between 2.5-10 µm) has been attributed to crustal re-suspension (Balachandran et al.,  
31 2000; Khillare et al., 2004; Srivastava and Jain, 2007b; Srivastava et al., 2009b; Chelani et  
32 al., 2010; Shridhar et al., 2010). A significant correlation has been reported between SPM

1 mass and Al, Ca, and Mg for Delhi (Shridhar et al., 2010). Higher concentrations of the  
2 coarse fraction of particulate matter in the summer season in Delhi are attributed to the hot  
3 winds that blow across from the Thar Desert in Rajasthan (Khillare et al., 2004; Srivastava et  
4 al., 2009b). This source is also found to be contributing substantially in other cities including  
5 Chandigarh (Bandhu et al., 2000).

6 Gupta et al. (2007) prepared local source profiles for road dust and soil dust for Kolkata and  
7 concluded that 36% and 17% of TSP was caused due to soil dust and 16% and 17% due to  
8 road dust at industrial and residential sites respectively. Major components of road dust and  
9 soil dust were found to be OC, TC, Fe,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  and OC, TC,  $\text{Cl}^-$  and  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  respectively. The  
10 presence of  $\text{Cl}^-$  and  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  at the residential site was attributed to a marine aerosol influence,  
11 but sea salt was not identified as a PM component by the CMB model.

12 Meena et al. (2011) used environmental magnetism for identification and characterization of  
13 polluted areas in New Delhi and found that soil in industrial and traffic areas contains high  
14 concentrations of heavy metals in the soil. This obviously leads to difficulties in  
15 discriminating soil-derived particles from industrial emissions and road dust.

16 *Vehicular sources:* Emissions arising from road vehicles are generally contributed by a mix  
17 of tailpipe emissions, and wear and tear of brakes and tyres and re-suspension of road dust  
18 (Rogge et al., 1993; Thorpe and Harrison, 2008). A series of markers, both elemental and  
19 organic, have been used for source attribution of PM to the vehicular sources including  
20 composite emissions, petrol and diesel emissions, tyre and brake wear, and crustal re-  
21 suspension due to the vehicular activity. According to international research, elemental  
22 markers include Cu, Zn, Pb, Ni, Mn, Mo and Sb (Lough et al., 2005; Almeida et al., 2006;  
23 Crawford et al., 2007; Begum et al., 2010) while molecular markers include hopanes and  
24 steranes (Rogge et al., 1993; Watson et al., 2002; Lough et al., 2005; Jaeckels et al., 2007;  
25 Yin et al., 2010; Fujiwara et al., 2011). However, since the introduction of unleaded petrol,  
26 the concentrations of Pb are seen to be reducing progressively (Stone et al., 2010), and hence,  
27 Pb is not used as a stand-alone marker for vehicular emissions. When gasoline is entirely  
28 lead-free, there are minor contributions to lead in air from brake pads and road dust re-  
29 suspension. Lower molecular weight n-alkanes (typically  $\text{C}_{19-25}$ ) are also found in vehicular  
30 exhaust (Rogge et al., 1993) and barium (Ba) has also been used a tracer for brake and tyre  
31 wear emissions (Lough et al., 2005; Gietl et al., 2010). Crustal elements like Fe and Al have  
32 also been reported to be found in diesel exhaust by Wang et al. (2003) but contributions from

1 this source are likely to be very small. It has been established that the lead in coarse dust is  
2 generally contributed by the road dust that is re-suspended due to vehicular motion and lead  
3 reprocessing facilities while lead in the fine mode comes primarily from leaded gasoline, and  
4 in some cases, from battery recycling plants (Santoso et al., 2011).

5 Internationally, elemental carbon (EC) (Song et al., 2006; Fujita et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2008;  
6 Robles et al., 2008; Stone et al., 2010; Yin et al., 2010) and chrysene, fluoranthene and  
7 pyrene (Larsen and Baker, 2003; Kleeman et al., 2008) are used extensively as markers for  
8 diesel exhaust while coronene, benzo(ghi)perylene and indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene are tracers for  
9 petrol vehicle exhaust (Fujita et al., 2007; Bullock et al., 2008; Kleeman et al., 2008).  
10 Pyrene, fluoranthene and phenanthrene have been reported to be present in tyre debris (Rogge  
11 et al., 1993). PAH are reported to be enriched in road dust and roadside soil (Smith et al.,  
12 1995; Agarwal, 2009), hence complicating the differentiation of this source from direct  
13 vehicle emissions.

14 In India, Pb is the most commonly used tracer element for identification of vehicular  
15 emissions; other elements including V, Mn, Co and Zn (Balachandran et al., 2000; Kumar et  
16 al., 2001; Chelani et al., 2008). Low-lead petrol was introduced in Delhi in 1994 followed by  
17 unleaded petrol in 1995. However, it was made mandatory only from 1998 and in the rest of  
18 the country from 2000. Lead is still used as a marker for traffic emissions as it is reported to  
19 be still present in the road dust/ soil due to its long residence time (Banerjee, 2003).  
20 However, a recent analysis by Vijayanand et al. (2008) found no significant correlation  
21 between Pb and SPM and this was attributed to the introduction of unleaded petrol, and the  
22 subsequent decrease in the Pb emissions. Studies in Delhi report lead concentrations of 0.66  
23  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (Balachandran et al., 2000),  $0.38 \pm 0.32 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (Khillare et al., 2004),  $0.37 \pm 0.12$   
24  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $1.04 \pm 0.20 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in the coarse fraction of  $\text{PM}_{10}$  and  $0.22 \pm 0.12 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to  $0.94 \pm$   
25  $0.17 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  in the fine fraction (Srivastava et al., 2009a) and  $0.039 \pm 0.005$  to  $0.087 \pm 0.014$   
26  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (Chelani et al., 2010). Platinum (Pt), palladium (Pd) and rhodium (Rh), components of  
27 automotive catalytic converters, were found to be significantly correlated in road dust  
28 samples, and higher concentrations were reported for samples from road junctions and traffic  
29 signals (Mathur et al., 2011). Similar results have been reported by Lough et al. (2005). Of  
30 the elements reported as tracers of vehicular emissions (Table 2) the inclusion of Cr and Co  
31 seems hard to justify – industrial emissions are more likely sources of these elements. Fe,  
32 Mn, and Cu, and to a lesser extent Pb are present in brake wear particles (Thorpe and  
33 Harrison, 2008; Gietl et al., 2010) and zinc is enriched in tyre wear particles. Ca is present in

1 lubricating oils, and Harrison et al. (2003) reported enrichment in the nanoparticle fraction of  
2 vehicle exhaust. In  $PM_{10}$  (and to a lesser extent  $PM_{2.5}$ ) concentrations of Ca are likely to be  
3 dominated by crustal sources.

4 EC, organic carbon (OC), hopanes and steranes have been used for differentiation between  
5 petrol and diesel vehicles in India (Chelani et al., 2010). Organic markers used include  
6 hopanes and steranes, and PAHs (Sharma et al., 2003; Chowdhury et al., 2007; Sharma et al.,  
7 2007; Masih et al., 2010). B(b)F, B(a)P, IP and B(ghi)P and B(a)A+ Chry, IP and Flan have  
8 been used as markers for petrol and diesel emissions respectively (Sharma et al., 2007).  
9 Vehicular emissions are a major source of PM and research indicates that they contribute  
10 between 10- 80 percent to particulate matter in cities across India. Comparison of such  
11 estimates is made difficult by the fact that the various studies have quantified different  
12 vehicular sources (exhausts, resuspension, abrasion, etc). Also, there has not been much  
13 detailed analysis regarding the source profiles for the different vehicle types typically found  
14 in India.

15 *Biomass burning:* Potassium (K) is used as a tracer of crustal dust in the coarse range and  
16 soluble K for biomass burning in the fine range of particulate matter. In India, it has been  
17 used a key elemental marker for biomass/wood combustion for TSP,  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  (Khare  
18 and Baruah, 2010; Shridhar et al., 2010) while levoglucosan is the key organic marker  
19 (Chowdhury et al., 2007).

20 Potassium and  $NH_4^+$  have also been used as markers for wood burning and agricultural  
21 activities (Khare and Baruah, 2010). In some cases, wood and biomass burning have been  
22 combined as one source, with K used as the marker.

23 Biomass combustion has been found to contribute in the range of 7-20 percent depending on  
24 season and location. It has been found to be one of the major sources in Delhi, particularly in  
25 winter due to the combustion of wood (Sharma et al., 2003; Chowdhury et al., 2007).  
26 However, in other cities, biomass combustion has not been found to contribute substantially  
27 to PM.

28 *Industrial emissions:* A range of tracers have been used for identification of industrial  
29 emissions including Cu, Cr, Mn, Ni, Co, Zn etc. Table 3 presents the sources of heavy metal  
30 as listed in the UK heavy metal emissions inventory. This will not, of course, be directly  
31 representative of India, but gives an idea of the main sources of commonly reported metals.

1 In international studies, Begum et al. (2004) used Ni, Pb and S as markers for industrial  
2 emissions, Song et al. (2006) used Ni, Cr, Fe and Mn, Yatkin and Bayram (2008) used Fe,  
3 Mn, Zn, and Pb, Lestari and Mauliadi (2009) used Zn and Fe as markers for the steel  
4 industry, and Al and Cr as markers for the electroplating industry and Tauler et al. (2009)  
5 used Zn, Fe, Mn and Cd as tracers of steel metallurgy.

6 A range of trace elements have been used as markers for industrial emissions in India. Negi et  
7 al. (1987) distinguished between textile industry emissions (V, Br), oil refinery emissions (S,  
8 Cu, Ni, and V) and non-ferrous industry emissions (Zn, Cu, and Mn). Similarly, Mouli et al.  
9 (2006) used Cd, As, Li, V, and Cu as markers for lead acid/ non-ferrous industry, and Mo, Fe,  
10 Se, Sb as markers for metallurgy. Kar et al. (2010) have also distinguished between tannery  
11 (Cr), industry (Co), and electroplating/galvanizing units (Zn, Cu, Ni). Shridhar et al. (2010)  
12 distinguished between industrial emissions (Ni, Cr, Mn, Cu, Zn) and emissions from battery  
13 units (Pb). Pb can also be emitted from paints, alloys, and plastic and rubber industries  
14 (Haritash and Kaushik, 2007).

15 There is clearly immense overlap of the marker elements attributed to industry with those  
16 associated with vehicular emissions, refuse/solid waste burning, crustal/road/resuspended  
17 dust and construction activities in Table 2. Given the similarity in the markers used for  
18 vehicular and industrial emissions, some authors have used markers like Cd, Cr, Ni, Pb, Zn,  
19 Cu etc. and identified the source as vehicular and industrial emissions (Khillare et al., 2004;  
20 Kothai et al., 2008; Khare and Baruah, 2010). A significant correlation was found between  
21 concentrations of Pb, Cr, Ni and Cd in New Delhi (Khillare et al., 2004) suggesting a  
22 common source, or a common meteorological control of concentrations.

23 *Refuse burning/incineration:* Key markers include zinc (Zn), chromium (Cr), and nickel (Ni).  
24 However, it is difficult to compare the source attributions as some authors have combined  
25 refuse burning, incineration and hazardous waste disposal, while others have restricted the  
26 source to incineration or refuse burning. In such cases, it is difficult to ascertain the exact  
27 contribution of the various activities. Further, since waste management is often conducted in  
28 an ad-hoc manner in Indian cities, it is difficult to ascertain the exact nature as well as well as  
29 the contribution of such a source. Sharma et al., (2003) found that refuse burning contributed  
30 significantly to the organic fraction of PM. In US studies, Zn and Cr have been used as  
31 markers for refuse burning/ incineration by Schauer et al. (1996) and Bullock et al. (2008).

1 *Coal combustion:* In international studies, key markers for coal combustion include As, Se,  
2 Te and  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  and it has been found to contribute between 6-30 percent to particulate matter in  
3 different studies (Khare and Baruah, 2010; Kumar et al., 2001; Gupta et al., 2007; Sharma et  
4 al., 2007; Srivastava and Jain, 2007b). Selenium (Se) has been reported to be a good marker  
5 for coal combustion (Hien et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2008). Other markers include Al and Si (Bi  
6 et al., 2007; Zeng et al., 2010), Zn (Almeida et al., 2006) and Cl (Song et al., 2006). Use of  
7 Al and Si opens the possibility of confusion of coal fly ash with crustal dusts, and Zn with  
8 traffic and/or refuse burning emissions. The use of Cl depends upon conversion of gaseous  
9 HCl emissions to particulate  $\text{NH}_4\text{Cl}$  which is not favoured by the generally hot Indian climate  
10 (Pio and Harrison, 1987). Picene has also been used as a marker for coal combustion (Stone  
11 et al., 2010; Yin et al., 2010). In general, Indian coal has a low sulphur content in comparison  
12 with other coals (Bhanarkar et al., 2008; Chikkatur, 2008) although the sulphur content of  
13 coal is reported to be high in eastern India (3.6-4.4%) (Khare and Baruah, 2010). Stone et al.  
14 (2010) also reported the use of high-sulphur coal in India while Negi et al. (1987) also  
15 reported Pb and Zn to be present in increased concentrations due to the use of domestic soft  
16 coal. Also, Indian coal is reported to have high ash content (Khare and Baruah, 2010) which  
17 is likely to elevate concentrations of crustal elements.

18 For New Delhi, where three coal-fired power plants are sited within the city boundaries,  
19 Sharma et al. (2007) attributed ~ 17 percent of the variance as per the PCA results to coal  
20 combustion while Srivastava and Jain (2007b) attributed approximately 15 percent of the  
21 variance of the PM 0.7 fraction to the source. Gupta et al. (2007) attributed nearly 40 percent  
22 of the TSPM and  $\text{PM}_{10}$  to coal combustion for a residential site in Kolkata.

23 *Marine aerosols:* Key markers include sodium (Na), potassium (K), chloride (Cl), and  
24 magnesium (Mg). However, since most of the source apportionment studies have been  
25 conducted in inland cities, marine aerosols are not found to be a key source, except in the  
26 case of Mumbai, a city with a huge coastline. Use of K offers possible confusion with  
27 wood/biomass combustion and Cl with coal burning, but a combination of the four elements  
28 should provide a reliable signature.

29 Authors have attributed between 9 (Kothai et al., 2008) to 30 (Chelani et al., 2008) percent of  
30 particulate matter to marine aerosols.

31 *Secondary aerosols:* Key markers include  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ . There has been very limited  
32 analysis of secondary aerosols and their contribution to PM mass has not been reported

1 widely. Chakrobarty and Gupta (2010) reported secondary aerosols to be contributing  
2 approximately 39% to the overall PM<sub>1</sub> mass. Khare and Baruah (2010) attributed 8% of the  
3 PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the city to secondary aerosol formation wherein NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> was attributed to agricultural  
4 and industrial activities and SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> was attributed to coal combustion and wood burning.  
5 Sulphate has been used as a marker for coal combustion in some Indian studies whereas NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>  
6 has been used as a marker for biomass combustion (Refer to Table 2).

7 Other sources that have been identified to contribute to PM mass in Indian cities include  
8 building/ construction dust (Srivastava and Jain, 2007a,b; Shridhar et al., 2010); refuse oil  
9 burning (Shridhar et al., 2010), wind-blown dust (Shridhar et al., 2010), two-stroke emissions  
10 with fugitive dust (Kothai et al., 2008) and tyre wear (Gupta et al., 2007). Karar and Gupta  
11 (2007) attributed 8 % of the variance to cooking.

12

### 13 **Source Apportionment of Particulate Matter in Delhi**

14 Delhi, the capital city of India, figures among the most polluted cities and presently faces the  
15 twin challenge of managing the demands of a growing city while still maintaining the quality  
16 of the environment. Concentrations of air pollutants in Delhi are often found to exceed the  
17 NAAQS despite repeated efforts to reduce air pollution. Delhi is reported to have nearly 33  
18 different industrial areas (<http://industries.delhigovt.nic.in/functions/faq.html#>) and there are  
19 a large number of small-scale industries including electroplating, pickling and galvanizing  
20 (Banerjee, 2003). Delhi also has three coal-fired power plants (Badarpur, Indraprastha and  
21 Rajghat) and the vehicle population is among the highest in the country. The sulphur content  
22 in the coal used in power plants in Delhi typically ranges between 0.35% and 0.50%  
23 (Chowdhury et al., 2007). Several studies have been undertaken for source apportionment of  
24 suspended particulate matter (SPM), PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> using receptor modelling in Delhi and  
25 most of them have attributed a large percentage of the PM to vehicular emissions, road dust  
26 and coal combustion (Balachandran et al., 2000; Khillare et al., 2004; Chowdhury et al.,  
27 2007; Sharma et al., 2007; Srivastava et al., 2008; Chelani et al., 2010; Shridhar et al., 2010).  
28 Goyal et al. (2010) have reported diesel vehicles to contribute nearly 28 percent of the total  
29 particulate matter in Delhi. Several other sources have also been reported for PM emissions  
30 in Delhi including open refuse burning (Khillare et al., 2004) and domestic use of biofuels  
31 and/or fossil fuels including kerosene (Mönkönnen et al., 2004). Sharma et al. (2007)  
32 attributed an increase in the concentration of PAHs to the increase in vehicle number and  
33 concluded that PAH release is dominated by vehicular emissions across all seasons in Delhi.

1 Agarwal (2009) reported an average value of  $4694 \pm 3028$   $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  for PAHs in soils at traffic  
2 sites while Sarkar et al. (2010) reported positive correlation between PAHs and markers for  
3 industrial and vehicular emissions including Zn, V, Ni, Cr and Cu.

4

5 Balachandran et al. (2000) conducted source apportionment for coarse and fine fractions of  
6  $\text{PM}_{10}$  using inorganic markers and PCA and found vehicular sources, industrial sources and  
7 crustal re-suspension to be the key contributors with each of them corresponding to three  
8 factors that explained 53.9, 19.4 and 15.7 percent of the variance respectively. Similar results  
9 were obtained by Khillare et al. (2004). Sharma et al. (2003) analysed particle phase organic  
10 compounds and identified vehicular sources, biomass burning and/or refuse burning as the  
11 key sources for the organic fraction of the particulate matter. Chowdhury et al. (2007)  
12 conducted the source apportionment for  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  using organic markers in New Delhi, Kolkata,  
13 Mumbai and Chandigarh. In the case of Delhi, they identified emissions from fossil fuel  
14 combustion (coal, diesel, and petrol) as responsible for about 25–33% of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  mass, and  
15 biomass combustion for about 7-20%. Srivastava and Jain (2007a) used CMB for source  
16 apportionment of particulate matter and found that vehicular sources contribute between 60-  
17 90% to the fine size PM while paved road dust, crustal re-suspension and solid waste etc  
18 contribute primarily to coarse particulate matter.

19 Tiwari et al. (2009) reported  $\text{PM}_{10}$  and  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  to be composed of undetermined fractions,  
20 secondary inorganic aerosols, salt aerosols and mineral matter. Chelani et al. (2010) found  
21 auto-exhaust and re-suspension of crustal dust to be the key contributors with industrial  
22 species, secondary aerosol and refuse burning contributing at specific sites. Shridhar et al.  
23 (2010) reported re-suspended dust, construction dust, industrial activities and biomass  
24 burning as the key sources of SPM and associated metals, and also noted that the total mass  
25 concentration of trace metals contributed circa 2% to the SPM at the urban site while at the  
26 rural site, it contributed less than 1%. They also found the SPM concentration at the urban  
27 site to be significantly correlated with Ca, Mg and Al. Contrary to most other source  
28 apportionment results for Delhi, Srivastava and Jain (2008) reported a minimal contribution  
29 of soil crustal dust to the SPM concentration.

30

31 Almost all of the studies in Delhi have used the factor analysis (PCA) method for source  
32 apportionment, and results are similar to the extent that re-suspended dust and vehicular  
33 emissions are found to be the major contributors. Other key sources include biomass

1 combustion, solid waste burning, coal combustion and construction dust. Results from CMB  
2 analysis have also yielded similar conclusions. However, LPG combustion was found to be a  
3 major contributor in residential areas in the city according to the results of CMB analysis as  
4 reported in CPCB (2010).

5 Srivastava et al. (2008, 2009a) conducted source apportionment using CMB and PCA for  
6 coarse and fine fractions of  $PM_{10}$  and found vehicular exhaust (62%) and crustal re-  
7 suspension (35%) to be the dominant contributors to the total ambient concentration in the  
8 fine size range of PM while crustal dust (64%) and vehicular pollution (29%) were found to  
9 be contributing to the coarse size range using CMB. Analysis of the same data using PCA  
10 revealed that crustal re-suspension and vehicular pollution contribute to the coarse range  
11 while vehicular pollution (86%) is the major contributor followed by crustal re-suspension  
12 (10%) are the key contributors in the case of the fine size range. For the coarse range, the  
13 results were found to be more or less similar but in the case of fine range fraction, while PCA  
14 attributed 85% to vehicular emissions, CMB attributed only 62% (Srivastava et al., 2008).  
15 The results of the analysis in terms of source identification and apportionment are in  
16 qualitative agreement with earlier results obtained by Balachandran et al., (2000) and Khillare  
17 et al. (2004) with vehicular/industrial sources and crustal re-suspension as discussed earlier.

18 Since most authors have used different source categories and have sampled different size  
19 fractions of PM, it is difficult to inter-compare the results of the various studies. Road  
20 dust/soil dust/re-suspended dust has been found to make a substantial contribution to the  
21 coarse fraction of PM, particularly in the summer season. While Khillare et al. (2004) and  
22 Shridhar et al. (2010) reported similar figures of 22% of variance and 25% of variance  
23 respectively, Srivastava et al. (2008) reported 67% of the variance for the coarse fraction of  
24 TSPM to be due to re-suspended dust. Only about 10% was found to be contributing to the  
25 TSPM fine fraction (Srivastava et al., 2008). Balachandran et al. (2000) reported this factor to  
26 be explaining 15.7% of the total variance for  $PM_{10}$ . Also, Tiwari et al. (2009) reported two  
27 factors associated with re-suspended dust for  $PM_{10}$ , explaining 27% and 10% each. Shridhar  
28 et al. (2010) also reported re-suspended material explaining 35% of the variance for rural site  
29 in Delhi. For  $PM_{2.5}$ , while Tiwari et al. (2009) reported one factor explaining 6% of the  
30 variance, Chowdhury et al. (2007) attributed between 11-42% of the total  $PM_{2.5}$  mass across  
31 different seasons with the highest figures for summer. The industrial emissions have been  
32 estimated to contribute approximately 100-900 tons of  $PM_{2.5}$ /year (Sahu et al., 2011).  
33 Balachandran et al. (2000) attributed 19.4% variance of the  $PM_{10}$  mass to industrial emissions

1 while Shridhar et al. (2010) attributed 20% of the variance of the TSP mass to the industrial  
2 emissions for the urban site. In some studies, vehicular and industrial emissions have been  
3 combined and used as one source category. For example, Balachandran et al. (2000)  
4 attributed 53.9% variance of the PM<sub>10</sub> mass while Khillare et al. (2004) attributed 60% of the  
5 variance of the TSP mass to the same source. Biomass combustion is known to be a major  
6 source for PM in the city, particularly in winter. Chowdhury et al. (2007) reported that  
7 biomass combustion contributes between 7-20% to the total PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass while Shridhar et al.  
8 (2010) reported that 10% of the variance for TSP is due to biomass burning.

9 CPCB (2010) reported the major sources of PM<sub>10</sub> as combustion sources, soil dust, re-  
10 suspended dust, vehicular emissions, industrial emissions, smelters and secondary aerosols  
11 based on factor analysis results. On the other hand, CMB analysis for PM<sub>10</sub> attributed 5-40%  
12 to vehicular emissions, 12-52% to open burning, 7-37% to DG sets, 14-50% to construction,  
13 11-19% to industries and 17-79% to re-suspended dust across the ten sampling sites and  
14 different seasons (summer, winter, post-monsoon).

### 15 **Source Apportionment of Particulate Matter in other Indian Cities**

16 Receptor modelling studies have been conducted in a range of other Indian cities using a  
17 range of different methods including CMB and multivariate analysis models. Wind-blown  
18 dust and wood/coal combustion were reported as the key sources of particulate matter (TSP)  
19 in Mt. Abu in Rajasthan (Negi et al., 1996). Bandu et al. (2000) conducted source  
20 apportionment using microscopic methods in Chandigarh and identified soil dust as the key  
21 source with others sources including industrial emissions, vehicular traffic and refuse  
22 burning. Vehicular traffic was not found to be contributing much to the particulate matter  
23 concentration in the city. Kumar et al. (2001) analysed particulate matter concentrations  
24 from two different traffic intersections in Mumbai and identified five potential sources  
25 including road dust, vehicular emissions, marine aerosols, industries (metal) and coal  
26 combustion while Tripathi et al. (2004) identified crustal/ road dust (69.41%), industrial  
27 emissions (11.76%) and fuel oil combustion (6.52%) as the key sources. Chelani et al. (2008)  
28 analysed samples using inorganic markers from different sites types and identified crustal  
29 factor, industrial emissions, vehicular emissions, and marine aerosols as the key sources with  
30 the proportions varying at the different sites. Motor vehicles (29%), industrial emissions  
31 (23%), two-stroke emissions with fugitive dust (18%), sea salt (9%) and soil (3%) have been  
32 identified as the key sources of PM<sub>2.5</sub> in Navi Mumbai (Maharashtra) using FA-MLR (Kothai  
33 et al., 2008).

1  
2 Sharma and Maloo (2005) reported high concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub>, metals and benzene-soluble  
3 organic fraction in the ambient PM<sub>10</sub> concentration in Kanpur. Gupta et al. (2007) used CMB  
4 for source apportionment for SPM and PM<sub>10</sub> at residential and industrial sites in Kolkata,  
5 West Bengal and reported coal combustion and vehicular emissions as the major contributors  
6 to PM<sub>10</sub> at the residential and industrial sites respectively. Other contributors included wood  
7 combustion, field burning, solid waste, tyre wear and soil and road dust. In 1995, key sources  
8 contributing to atmospheric aerosols in Agra were listed as crustal sources, industrial  
9 emissions, wood burning and coal combustion in brick kilns (Kulshrestha et al., 1995)  
10 whereas in 2009, Kulshrestha et al. (2009) identified re-suspended dust (due to vehicular  
11 activity), solid waste incineration and industrial emissions to be key contributors to the  
12 metallic fraction of particulate matter at an urban site in the city of Agra whereas re-  
13 suspension, construction activities and industrial emissions were found to be the key sources  
14 of PM in the rural location using PCA. Khare and Baruah (2010) analysed sources of PM<sub>2.5</sub> in  
15 Jorhat, Assam using enrichment factor analysis and absolute PCA and reported traffic  
16 induced crustal sources (38%), coal combustion (26%), industrial and vehicular emissions  
17 (19%), wood burning (9%), and secondary aerosol formation (8%) as the key sources.

18 Gummeneni et al. (2011) analysed PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in a traffic corridor in  
19 Hyderabad and identified resuspended dust, vehicular pollution, combustion, industrial  
20 emissions and refuse burning as major sources with re-suspended dust being dominant in the  
21 case of PM<sub>10</sub> and vehicular pollution being dominant in the case of PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

22 Detailed information about receptor model and tracer type and chemical component  
23 concentrations from the studies is presented in Table S1.

24

### 25 **Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) Source Apportionment Study**

26 The Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB, 2010) recently released the six-city source  
27 apportionment analysis that was initially commissioned as a part of recommendations of the  
28 Auto Fuel Policy (2003). A number of research institutions including TERI, NEERI, ARAI,  
29 IIT-Kanpur and IIT-Chennai were involved in the analysis, which included pollutant  
30 monitoring, preparation of emission inventories and receptor and dispersion modelling. The  
31 results of the analysis have been used to prepare city-specific action plans, and may also feed  
32 into the next auto policy of India.

33

1 Though the methodology used for the study is robust, and can help in conclusive  
2 determination of action points, the execution has been poor, and there are many gaps that  
3 need to be filled before using the information for actual implementation.

4 One of the major considerations in conducting any source apportionment study using  
5 multivariate methods is to ensure a high ratio between the number of samples collected and  
6 the number of variables being analysed, and if that ratio is too low, the results can be  
7 misleading. For example, in the case of Chennai, data from 30 samples were analysed for 18  
8 variables. Also, the results obtained from CMB and FA are in many cases not consistent with  
9 each other. For example, in Delhi, while the CMB results indicated construction dust to be a  
10 major source at several locations, results from factor analysis do not include that source at all.  
11 Similarly, the use of tracer markers is ambiguous in several cases including the use of only  
12 OC, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>, EC and TC for identification of auto exhaust or the use of Ni, Na and Si for soil  
13 dust as opposed to Al, Ba, Ca, Mg, Mn, Fe, OC, Si and Sr for re-suspended dust. In another  
14 case, only the Mg<sup>2+</sup> ion has been used to identify the soil dust component for one of the sites  
15 in Delhi, and only TC and EC are used to identify auto exhaust at another site.

16 As discussed above, a number of studies have been conducted previously for source  
17 apportionment of PM<sub>10</sub> in New Delhi, Mumbai etc and it is interesting to note that the results  
18 of the current analysis are at variance with the earlier reports. While some of the conclusions  
19 are similar in both cases (e.g. percentage contribution of road dust to PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations),  
20 there are a number of differences in terms of apportionment of particulate matter to various  
21 sources. For example, none of the previous studies have identified domestic LPG use as a  
22 source of PM<sub>10</sub> in New Delhi. Also, very limited analysis was conducted on PM<sub>2.5</sub> and given  
23 its importance in terms of human health impacts, more detailed analysis needs to be  
24 conducted.

25

## 26 **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

27 There have been many studies conducted in India using receptor modelling methods for  
28 source apportionment of particulate matter. India is a very large and diverse country, and  
29 unsurprisingly the studies have drawn widely differing conclusions. Even within individual  
30 Indian cities, different authors have come to widely varying conclusions over source  
31 attribution and apportionment, and this may to some extent be a result of using different  
32 sampling locations and seasons. Most studies have identified vehicle emissions and soil/road  
33 dust as a major contribution to the fine and coarse fractions respectively, but differentiation

1 of these from industrial emissions and other sources such as construction activity has been  
2 poor.

3

4 The studies conducted to date do not inspire any degree of confidence that representative  
5 knowledge of the source apportionment of any PM size fraction has been gained for any  
6 Indian city. The reasons for this view are multiple and include the following:

- 7 • The vast majority of studies have used multivariate statistical methods which have  
8 yielded factors represented by combinations of elemental and ionic constituents which  
9 cannot be unequivocally attributed to any specific source. Faced with factors associating  
10 often strange combinations of chemical components, authors feel obliged to attribute a  
11 source, but in many cases these are highly unconvincing. The possible reasons are many  
12 and include genuine collinearity of sources, or more likely an inadequate number of  
13 samples relative to the number of analytes leading to instability in the statistical model.  
14 This may be seen in Table S1 which shows that most of the studies used well under 100  
15 samples. It is recommended that future studies using multivariate statistical methods  
16 collect at least 100 samples and preferably more.
- 17 • The use of unweighted models such as PCA leads to less adequate factor resolution than  
18 more recent weighted models such as PMF. The latter is strongly recommended for use  
19 in future studies.
- 20 • Failure in most cases to distinguish vehicle exhaust from non-exhaust vehicle emissions,  
21 particularly resuspension of road dust, and/or inability to differentiate regional crustal  
22 sources (e.g. desert dust) from local wind-blown soils and from resuspended road dust.  
23 Making a distinction between road dust and local soils can be difficult under any  
24 circumstances if the soils are polluted by vehicle emissions or the road dusts contain a  
25 significant soil contribution. However, separating these sources, and in particular  
26 quantifying the vehicle exhaust contribution alone, and differentiating regional crustal  
27 sources from local soils and road dust, is crucial, as the policy response depends heavily  
28 upon these insights.
- 29 • Most studies pay little attention to secondary pollutants. Sulphate, which in developed  
30 countries is almost exclusively secondary, tends to be attributed to local primary sources,  
31 and regional transport processes are largely ignored. Similarly, nitrate receives little  
32 attention despite its complex atmospheric chemistry and frequent association with  
33 regional processes in developed countries (Abdalmogith and Harrison, 2005). Secondary

1 organic aerosol may be an important contributor to PM mass in India as the conditions  
2 exist to facilitate its formation from both anthropogenic and biogenic precursors, but the  
3 literature ignores it.

- 4 • There is a lack of multi-site studies. Where these exist, they tend to use multiple sites  
5 within a city (e.g. CPCB, 2010) rather than using urban/rural contrasts to elucidate the  
6 importance of emissions within the city relative to the regional background.
- 7 • Emissions inventory data are very scarce. These need to be spatially and chemically  
8 disaggregated. Knowledge of city-specific emissions inventories for specific chemical  
9 components would give greater confidence in assigning sources to factors identified  
10 through multivariate receptor models.
- 11 • There has been insufficient use of size fractionation of particulate matter. Most studies  
12 have focussed upon TSP or PM<sub>10</sub>, therefore not benefiting from the additional insights to  
13 be gained from separating coarse from fine particles, and in doing so achieving a crude  
14 separation of crustal/soil/road dust/construction sources from those associated with high  
15 temperature processes (fuel combustion, metallurgical industries, etc) and gas-to-particle  
16 conversion to form secondary pollutants.
- 17 • There has, to date, been insufficient use of organic molecular markers. While these  
18 alone will not answer all source apportionment questions, they are an important tool in  
19 receptor modelling and could help to sharpen up both CMB and multivariate model  
20 studies.
- 21 • Given the rather weak performance of multivariate receptor model studies in India, a  
22 greater use of CMB methods is recommended. This will require the use of locally  
23 determined source profiles, as well as use of emissions inventories to identify those  
24 source types which need to be included. The Central Pollution Control Board study  
25 (CPCB, 2010) has generated useful data in regard of local source profiles, but this may  
26 need to be complemented by additional measurements.
- 27 • Source apportionment based upon emissions inventories and dispersion models is a  
28 valuable complement to receptor modelling. Progress in this respect was made by the  
29 Central Pollution Control Board study (CPCB, 2010), but it is disappointing that that  
30 study failed to develop explanations for the frequently large divergences between  
31 modelled and measured PM concentrations. The study also used both multivariate  
32 statistical and CMB source apportionment models, but failed to reconcile the sometimes  
33 highly divergent conclusions of the two approaches.

1

2 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

3 Pallavi Pant gratefully acknowledges financial support from the University of Birmingham  
4 fund for collaboration with India.

## 1 REFERENCES

- 2 Abdalmogith, S.S., Harrison R.M., 2005. The use of trajectory cluster analysis to examine the  
3 long-range transport of secondary inorganic aerosol in the UK, *Atmospheric Environment* 39,  
4 6686-6695.  
5
- 6 Agarwal, T., 2009. Concentration level, pattern and toxic potential of PAHs in traffic soil of  
7 Delhi, India, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 171, 894-900.  
8
- 9 Almeida, S.M., Pio, C.A., Freitas, M.C., Reis, M.A., Trancoso, M.A., 2006. Source  
10 apportionment of atmospheric urban aerosol based on weekdays/weekend variability:  
11 evaluation of road re-suspended dust contribution, *Atmospheric Environment* 40, 2058-2067.  
12
- 13 Balachandran, S., Meena, B.R. and Khillare, P.K., 2000. Particle size distribution and its  
14 elemental composition in the ambient air of Delhi, *Environment International* 26, 49-54.  
15
- 16 Bandhu, H.K., Puri, S., Garg, M.L., Singh, B., Shahi, J.S., Mehta, D., Swietlicki, E., Dhawan,  
17 D.K., Mangal, P.C., Singh, N., 2000. Elemental composition and sources of air pollution in  
18 the city of Chandigarh, India, using EDXRF and PIXE techniques, *Nuclear Instruments and*  
19 *Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms* 160,  
20 126-138.  
21
- 22 Banerjee, A.D.K., 2003. Heavy metal levels and solid phase speciation in street dusts of  
23 Delhi, India, *Environmental Pollution* 123, 95-105.  
24
- 25 Basha, S., Jhala, J., Thorat, R., Goel, S., Trivedi, R., Shah, K., Menon, G., Gaur, P., Mody,  
26 K.H., Jha, B., 2010. Assessment of heavy metal content in suspended particulate matter of  
27 coastal industrial town, Mithapur, Gujarat, India, *Atmospheric Research* 97, 257-265.  
28
- 29 Begum, B.A., Kim, E., Biswas, S.K., Hopke, P.K., 2004. Investigation of sources of  
30 atmospheric aerosol at urban and semi-urban areas in Bangladesh, *Atmospheric Environment*  
31 38, 3025-3038.  
32
- 33 Begum, B.A., Biswas, S.K., Hopke, P.K., 2010. Key issues in controlling air pollutants in  
34 Dhaka, Bangladesh, *Atmospheric Environment*, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.10.02  
35
- 36 Bhanarkar, A.D., Gavane, A.G., Tajne, D.S., Tamhane, S.M., Nema, P., 2008. Composition  
37 and size distribution of particules emissions from a coal-fired power plant in India, *Fuel* 87,  
38 2095-2101.  
39
- 40 Bhanuprasad, S.G., Venkataraman, C., Bhushan, M., 2008. Positive Matrix Factorization and  
41 trajectory modelling for source identification: A new look at Indian Ocean Experiment ship  
42 observations, *Atmospheric Environment* 42, 4836-4852.  
43
- 44 Bi, X., Feng, Y., Wu, J., Wang, Y., Zhu, T., 2007. Source apportionment of PM<sub>10</sub> in six cities  
45 of northern China, *Atmospheric Environment* 41 (5), 903-912.  
46  
47  
48

- 1 Bullock, K.R., Duvall, R.M., Norris, G.A., McDow, S.R., Hays, M.D., 2008. Evaluation of  
2 the CMB and PMF models using organic molecular markers in fine particulate matter  
3 collected during the Pittsburgh Air Quality Study, *Atmospheric Environment* 42 (29), 6897-  
4 6904.
- 5  
6 Callén, M.S., de la Cruz, M.T., López, J.M., Navarro, M.V., Mastral, A.M., 2009.  
7 Comparison of receptor models for source apportionment of the PM<sub>10</sub> in Zaragoza (Spain),  
8 *Chemosphere* 76, 1120-1129.
- 9  
10 Caselli, M., Gennaro, G de, Ielpo, P., 2006. A comparison between two receptor models to  
11 determine the source apportionment of particulate pollutants, *Environmetrics* 17, 507-516.
- 12  
13 Chakrobarty, A., Gupta, T., 2010. Chemical Characterization of Submicron Aerosol in  
14 Kanpur Region: a Source Apportionment Study, *Aerosol and Air Quality Research* 10, 433-  
15 445.
- 16  
17 Chelani, A.B., Gajghate, D.G., Devotta, S., 2008. Source Apportionment of PM<sub>10</sub> in Mumbai,  
18 India Using CMB Model, *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* 81, 190-  
19 195.
- 20  
21 Chelani, A.B., Gajghate, D.G., Chalapati Rao, CV., Devotta, S., 2010. Particle size  
22 distribution in ambient air of Delhi and its statistical analysis, *Bulletin of Environmental*  
23 *Contamination and Toxicology* 85 (1), 22-27.
- 24  
25 Chikkatur, A.P., 2008. A resource and technology assessment of coal in India, Coal Initiative  
26 Reports, White Paper Series. Available at [http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/india-coal-](http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/india-coal-technology.pdf)  
27 [technology.pdf](http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/india-coal-technology.pdf) [Accessed March 21, 2011].
- 28  
29 Chowdhury, Z., Zheng, M., Schauer, J.J., Sheesley, R.J., Salmon, L.G., Cass, G.R., Russell,  
30 A.G., 2007. Speciation of fine organic carbon particles and source apportionment of PM<sub>2.5</sub> in  
31 Indian cities, *Journal of Geophysical Research* 112, D15303, doi:10.1029/2007JD008386.
- 32  
33 Colville, R.N., Gómez-Perales, J. E., Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2003) Use of dispersion  
34 modelling to assess road-user exposure to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and its source apportionment, *Atmospheric*  
35 *Environment*, 37(20), 2773-2782.
- 36  
37 Cooper, J.A., Watson, J.G., 1980. Receptor oriented methods of air particulate source  
38 apportionment, *Journal of Air Pollution Control Association* 30 (10), 1116-1125.
- 39  
40 CPCB, 2010. Air quality monitoring, emission inventory and source apportionment study for  
41 Indian cities, Central Pollution Control Board, February 2010.
- 42  
43 Crawford, J., Chambers, S., Cohen, D.D., Dyer, L., Wang, T., Zahorowski, R., 2007.  
44 Receptor modelling using positive matrix factorization, back trajectories and Radon-222,  
45 *Atmospheric Environment* 41, 6823-6837.
- 46  
47 Fujita, E.M., Campbell, D.E., Arnott, W.P., Chow, J.C., Zielinska, B., 2007. Evaluations of  
48 the Chemical Mass Balance Method for Determining Contributions of Gasoline and Diesel  
49 Exhaust to Ambient Carbonaceous Aerosols, *Journal of Air and Waste Management*  
*Association* 57, 721-740.

1 Fujiwara, F.G., Gomez, D.R., Dawidowski, L., Perelman, P., Faggi, A., 2011. Metals  
2 associated with airborne particulate matter in road dust and tree bark collected in a megacity  
3 (Buenos Aires, Argentina), *Ecological Indicators* 11, 240-247.  
4  
5 Gietl, J.K., Lawrence, R., Thorpe, A.J., Harrison, R.M., 2010. Identification of brake wear  
6 particles and derivation of a quantitative tracer for brake dust at a major road, *Atmospheric  
7 Environment*, 44 141-146.  
8  
9 Gordon, G.E., 1980. Receptor Models, *Environmental Science and Technology* 14, 792-800.  
10  
11 Gordon, G.E., 1988. Receptor Models, *Environmental Science and Technology* 22, 1132-  
12 1142.  
13  
14 Goyal, P., Jaiswal, N., Kumar A., Dadoo, J.K., Dwarakanath, M., 2010. Air quality impact  
15 assessment of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM due to diesel vehicles in India, *Transportation Research Part D*  
16 15, 298-303.  
17  
18 Gu, J., Pitz, M., Schenlle-Kreis, J., Diemer, J., Reller, A., Zimmermann, R., Soentgen, J.,  
19 Stoelzel, M., Wichmann, H.E., Peters, A., Cyrus, J., 2011. Source apportionment of ambient  
20 particles: Comparison of positive matrix factorization analysis applied to particle size  
21 distribution and chemical composition data, *Atmospheric Environment*, 45, 1849-1857.  
22  
23 Gummeneni, S., Yusup, Y. B., Chavali, M., Samadi, S.Z., 2011. Source apportionment of  
24 particulate matter in the ambient air of Hyderabad city, India, *Atmospheric Research*, doi:  
25 10.1016/j.atmosres.2011.05.002  
26  
27 Guo, H., Ding, A.J., So, K.L., Ayoko, G., Li, Y.S., Hung, W.T., 2009. Receptor modelling of  
28 source apportionment of Hong Kong aerosols and the implication of urban and regional  
29 contribution, *Atmospheric Environment* 43, 1159-1169.  
30  
31 Gupta, A.K., Karar, K., Srivastava, A., 2007. Chemical mass balance source apportionment  
32 of PM<sub>10</sub> and TSP in residential and industrial sites of an urban region of Kolkata, India,  
33 *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 142, 279-287.  
34  
35 Haritash, A. K., Kaushik, C. P., 2007. Assessment of seasonal enrichment of heavy metals in  
36 respirable suspended particulate matter of a sub-urban city, *Environmental Monitoring and  
37 Assessment* 128, 411-420.  
38  
39 Harrison, R.M., Smith, D.J.T., Luhana, L., 1996. Source apportionment of atmospheric  
40 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons collected from an urban location in Birmingham, U.K.,  
41 *Environmental Science and Technology* 30, 825-832.  
42  
43 Harrison, R.M., Smith, D.J.T., Pio, C.A., Castro, L.M., 1997. Comparative receptor  
44 modelling study of airborne particulate pollutants in Birmingham (United Kingdom),  
45 Coimbra (Portugal) and Lahore (Pakistan), *Atmospheric Environment* 31, 3309-3321.  
46  
47 Harrison, R.M., Tilling, R., Callen Romero, M.S., Harrad S., Jarvis K., 2003. A study of trace  
48 metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the roadside environment, *Atmospheric  
49 Environment* 37, 2391-2402.  
50

1 Henry, R.C., Lewis, C. W., Hopke, P.K., Williamson, H.J., 1984. Review of receptor model  
2 fundamentals, Atmospheric Environment 18, 1507-1515.  
3  
4 Hien, P.D., Binh, N. T., Truong, Y., Ngo, N.T., Sieu, L.N., 2001. Comparative receptor  
5 modelling study of TSP, PM<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>2-10</sub> in Ho Chi Minh City, Atmospheric Environment  
6 35, 2669-2678.  
7  
8 Hopke, P.K., 1991. An introduction to receptor modelling, Chemometrics and Intelligent  
9 Laboratory Systems 10, 21-43.  
10  
11 Jaeckels, J.M., Bae, M., Schauer, J.J., 2007. Positive Matrix Factorization (PMF) Analysis of  
12 Molecular Marker Measurements to Quantify the Sources of Organic Aerosols,  
13 Environmental Science and Technology 41, 5763-5769.  
14  
15 Kar, S., Maity, J.P., Samal, A.C., Santra, S.C., 2010. Metallic components of traffic-induced  
16 urban aerosol, their spatial variation, and source apportionment, Environmental Monitoring  
17 and Assessment 168, 561-574.  
18  
19 Karar, K., Gupta, A.K., 2007. Source apportionment of PM<sub>10</sub> at residential and industrial sites  
20 of an urban region of Kolkata, India, Atmospheric Research 84, 30-41.  
21  
22 Khare, P., Baruah, B.P., 2010. Elemental characterization and source identification of PM<sub>2.5</sub>  
23 using multivariate analysis at the suburban site of North-East India, Atmospheric Research  
24 98, 148-162.  
25  
26 Khillare, P.K., Balachandran, S., Meena, B.R., 2004. Spatial and temporal variation of heavy  
27 metals in atmospheric aerosol in India, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 90, 1-21.  
28  
29 Kleeman, M.J., Riddle, S. G., Robert, M.A., Jakober, C.A., 2008. Lubricating oil and fuel  
30 contributions to particulate matter emissions from light-duty gasoline and heavy-duty  
31 vehicles, Environmental Science and Technology 42, 235-242.  
32  
33 Kong, S., Han, B., Bai, Z., Chen, L., Shi, J., Xu, Z., 2010. Receptor modelling of PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>  
34 and TSP in different seasons and long-range transport analysis at a coastal site of Tianjin,  
35 China, Science of The Total Environment 408, 4681-4694.  
36  
37 Kothai, P., Saradhi, I.V., Prathibha, P., Pandit, G.G., Puranik, V.D., 2008. Source  
38 apportionment of coarse and fine particulate matter at Navi Mumbai, India, Aerosol and Air  
39 Quality Research 8, 423-436.  
40  
41 Kulshrestha, U.C., Kumar, N., Saxena, Kumari, K.M., Srivastava, S.S., 1995. Identification  
42 of the nature and source of atmospheric aerosols near the Taj Mahal (India), Environmental  
43 Monitoring and Assessment 34, 1-11.  
44  
45 Kulshrestha, A., Satsangi, P.G., Masih, J., Taneja, A., 2009. Metal concentration of PM<sub>2.5</sub> and  
46 PM<sub>10</sub> particles and seasonal variations in urban and rural environment of Agra, India, Science  
47 of The Total Environment 407, 6196-6204.  
48

- 1 Kumar, A.V., Patil, R.S., Nambi, K.S.V., 2001. Source apportionment of suspended  
2 particulate matter at two traffic junctions in Mumbai, India, *Atmospheric Environment* 35,  
3 4245-4251.  
4
- 5 Lai, C.H., Chen, K.S., Ho, Y.T., Peng, Y.P., Chou, Y., 2005. Receptor modeling of source  
6 contributions to atmospheric hydrocarbons in urban Kaohsiung, Taiwan, *Atmospheric*  
7 *Environment* 39, 4543-4559.  
8
- 9 Larsen, R.K., Baker, J.E., 2003. Source apportionment of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons  
10 in the urban atmosphere: a comparison of three methods, *Environmental Science and*  
11 *Technology* 37, 1873-1881.  
12
- 13 Lee, S., Liu, W., Wang, Y., Russell, A.G., Edgerton, E.S., 2008. Source apportionment of  
14 PM<sub>2.5</sub>: Comparing PMF and CMB results for four ambient monitoring sites in the  
15 southeastern United States, *Atmospheric Environment* 42, 4126-4137.  
16
- 17 Lestari, P., Mauliadi, Y.D., 2009. Source apportionment at mixed urban site in Indonesia  
18 using PMF, *Atmospheric Environment* 43, 1760-1770.  
19
- 20 Lough, G.C., Schauer, J.J., Park, J., Shafer, M.M., Deminter, J.T., Weinstein, J.P., 2005.  
21 Emissions of metals associated with motor vehicle roadways, *Environmental Science and*  
22 *Technology* 39, 826-836.  
23
- 24 Laupsa, H., Denby, B., Larssen, S. and Schaug, J., 2009. Source apportionment of particulate  
25 matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) in an urban area using dispersion, receptor and inverse modelling,  
26 *Atmospheric Environment*, 43(31), 4733-4744.  
27
- 28 Masih, A., Saini, R., Singhvi, R., Taneja, A., 2010. Concentrations, sources, and exposure  
29 profiles of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) in the north  
30 central part of India, *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 163(1-4), 421-431.  
31
- 32 Mathur, R., Balaram, V., Satyanarayanan, M., Sawant, S.S., Ramesh, S.L., 2011.  
33 Anthropogenic platinum, palladium and rhodium concentrations in road dusts from  
34 Hyderabad city, India, *Environmental Earth Sciences* 62, 1085-1098.  
35
- 36 Meena, N. K., Maiti, S., Shrivastava, A., 2011. Discrimination between anthropogenic  
37 (pollution) and lithogenic magnetic fraction in urban soils (Delhi, India) using environmental  
38 magnetism, *Journal of Applied Geophysics* 73, 121-129.  
39
- 40 Mönkönnen, P., Uma, R., Srinivasan, D., Koponen, I.K., Lehtinen, K.E.J, Hämeri, K.,  
41 Suresh, R., Sharma, V.P., Kulmala, M., 2004. Relationship and variations of aerosol number  
42 and PM<sub>10</sub> mass concentrations in a highly polluted urban environment- New Delhi, India,  
43 *Atmospheric Environment* 38, 425-433.  
44
- 45 Mouli, P.C., Mohan, S.V., Balaram, V., Praveen Kumar, M., Reddy, S.J., 2006. A study on  
46 trace elemental composition of atmospheric aerosols at a semi-arid urban site using ICP-MS  
47 technique, *Atmospheric Environment* 40, 136-146.  
48
- 49 NAEI, 2011. National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (n.d.) Emissions of air pollutants in  
50 the UK [WWW] Available from <http://naei.defra.gov.uk/> [Accessed March 29, 2011].

- 1 Negi, B.S., Sadasivan, S., Mishra, U.C., 1987. Aerosol composition and sources in urban  
2 areas in India, *Atmospheric Environment* 21 (6), 1259-1266.  
3
- 4 Negi, B.S., Sadasivan, S., Nambi, K.S.V., Pande, B.M., 1996. Characterization of  
5 atmospheric dust at Gurushikar, Mt. Abu, Rajasthan, *Environmental Monitoring and*  
6 *Assessment* 40, 253-259.  
7
- 8 Negi, B.S., Jha, S.K., Chavan, S.B., Sadasivan, S., Goyal, A., Sapru, M.L., Bhat, C.L., 2002.  
9 Atmospheric dust loads and their elemental composition at a background site in India,  
10 *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 73, 1-6.  
11
- 12 Pandey, P.K., Patel, K.S., Subrt, P., 1998. Trace elemental composition of atmospheric  
13 particulate at Bhilai in central-east India, *Science of the Total Environment* 215, 123-134.  
14
- 15 Pio, C.A., Harrison R.M., 1987. Vapour pressure of ammonium chloride aerosol: Effect of  
16 temperature and humidity, *Atmospheric Environment* 21, 2711-2715.  
17
- 18 Ramadan, Z., Eickhout, B., Song, Xin-Hua, Buydens, L.M.C., Hopke, P.K., 2003.  
19 Comparison of positive matrix factorization and multilinear engine for the source  
20 apportionment of particulate pollutants, *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*  
21 *66*, 15-28.  
22
- 23 Rastogi, N., Sarin, M.M., 2009. Quantitative chemical composition and characteristics of  
24 aerosols over western India: One-year record of temporal variability, *Atmospheric*  
25 *Environment* 43, 3481-3488.  
26
- 27 Robinson, A. L., Subramanian, R., Donahue, N. M., Bernardo-Bricker, A., Rogge, W.F.,  
28 2006. Source apportionment of molecular markers and organic aerosol. 2. Biomass smoke,  
29 *Environmental Science and Technology* 40, 7811-7819.  
30
- 31 Robles, L.A., Fu, J.S., Reed, G.D., 2008. Modelling and source apportionment of diesel  
32 particulate matter, *Environment International* 34, 1-11.  
33
- 34 Rogge, W.F., Hildemann, L. M., Mazurek, M.A., Cass, G.R., 1993. Sources of fine organic  
35 aerosol 3. Road Dust, Tire Debris, and Organometallic Brake Lining Dust: Roads as Sources  
36 and Sinks, *Environmental Science and Technology* 27, 1892-1904.  
37
- 38 Sahu, S. K., Beig, G., Parkhi, N.S., 2011. Emissions inventory of anthropogenic PM<sub>2.5</sub> and  
39 PM<sub>10</sub> in Delhi during Commonwealth Games 2010, *Atmospheric Environment* 45, 6180-  
40 6190.  
41
- 42 Santoso, M., Lestiani, D.D., Mukhtar, R., Hamonangan, E., Syafrul, H., Markwitz, A.,  
43 Hopke, P.K., 2011. Preliminary study of the sources of ambient air pollution in Serpong,  
44 Indonesia, *Atmospheric Pollution Research* 2, 190-196.  
45
- 46 Sarkar, S., Khillare, P.K., Jyethi, D.S., Hasan, A., Parween, M., 2010. Chemical speciation of  
47 respirable suspended particulate matter during a major firework festival in India, *Journal of*  
48 *Hazardous Materials* 184, 321-330.  
49

1 Schauer, J.J., Rogge, W. F., Hildemann, L.M., Mazurek, M.A., Cass, G.R., 1996. Source  
2 apportionment of airborne particulate matter using organic compounds as tracers,  
3 Atmospheric Environment 30, 3837-3855.  
4

5 Sharma, D.N., Sawant, A.A., Uma, R., Cocker III, D.R., 2003. Preliminary chemical  
6 characterization of particle-phase organic compounds in New Delhi, India, Atmospheric  
7 Environment 37, 4317-4323.  
8

9 Sharma, M., Maloo, S., 2005. Assessment of ambient air PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and characterization  
10 of PM<sub>10</sub> in the city of Kanpur, India, Atmospheric Environment 39, 6015-6026.  
11

12 Sharma, H., Jain, V.K., Khan, Z.H., 2007. Characterization and source identification of  
13 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the urban environment of Delhi, Chemosphere  
14 66, 302-310.  
15

16 Shi, G.-L., Zeng, F., Li, X., Feng, Y.-C., Wang, Y.-Q., Liu, G.-X., Zhu, T., 2011. Estimated  
17 contributions and uncertainties of pca/mlr-cmb results: Source apportionment for synthetic  
18 and ambient datasets, Atmospheric Environment 45, 2811-2819.  
19

20 Shridhar, V., Khillare, P.S., Agarwal, T., Ray, S., 2010. Metallic species in ambient  
21 particulate matter at rural and urban location of Delhi, Journal of Hazardous Materials 175,  
22 600-607.  
23

24 Shrivastava, M.K., Subramanian, R., Rogge, W.F., Robinson, A.L., 2007. Sources of organic  
25 aerosol: Positive matrix factorization of molecular marker data and comparison of results  
26 from different source apportionment models, Atmospheric Environment 41, 9353-9369.  
27

28 Smith, D.J.T., Edelhauser, E.C., Harrison, R.M., 1995. Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon  
29 concentrations in road dust and soil samples collected in the United Kingdom and Pakistan,  
30 Environmental Technology 16, 45-53.  
31

32 Song, Y., Zhang, Y., Xie, S., Zeng, L., Zheng, M., Salmon, L.G., Shao, M., Slanina, S., 2006.  
33 Source apportionment of PM<sub>2.5</sub> in Beijing by positive matrix factorization, Atmospheric  
34 Environment 40, 1526-1537.

35 Srimuruganandam, B., Shiva Nagendra, S. M., 2011. Chemical characterization of PM (10)  
36 and PM (2.5) mass concentrations emitted by heterogeneous traffic, Atmospheric  
37 Environment 45, 3091-3102.  
38

39 Srivastava, A., Jain, V.K., 2007a. Seasonal trends in coarse and fine particle sources in Delhi  
40 by the chemical mass balance receptor model, Journal of Hazardous Materials 144, 283-291.  
41

42 Srivastava, A., Jain, V. K., 2007b. Size distribution and source identification of total  
43 suspended particulate matter and associated heavy metals in the urban atmosphere of Delhi,  
44 Chemosphere 68, 579-589.  
45

46 Srivastava, A., Jain, V.K., 2008. Source apportionment of suspended particulate in a clean  
47 area of Delhi: A note, Transportation Research Part D 13, 59-63.  
48

- 1 Srivastava, A., Gupta, S., Jain, V.K., 2008. Source apportionment of total suspended  
2 particulate matter in coarse and fine ranges over Delhi, *Aerosol and Air Quality Research* 8,  
3 188-200.  
4
- 5 Srivastava, A., Gupta, S., Jain, V.K., 2009a. Winter-time size distribution and source  
6 apportionment of total suspended particulate matter and associated metals in Delhi,  
7 *Atmospheric Research* 92, 88-99.  
8
- 9 Srivastava, A., Jain, V.K., Srivastava, A., 2009b. SEM-EDX analysis of various size aerosols  
10 in Delhi India, *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 150, 405-416.  
11
- 12 Stone, E., Schauer, J., Quraishi, T.A., Mahmood, A., 2010. Chemical characterization and  
13 source apportionment of fine and coarse particulate matter in Lahore, Pakistan, *Atmospheric*  
14 *Environment* 44, 1062-1070.  
15
- 16 Tauler, R., Viana, M., Querol, X., Alastuey, A., Flight, R.M., Wentzell, P.D., Hopke, P.K.,  
17 2009. Comparison of the results obtained by four receptor modelling methods in aerosol  
18 source apportionment studies, *Atmospheric Environment* 43, 3989-3997.  
19
- 20 Thorpe, A., Harrison, R.M., 2008. Sources and properties of non-exhaust particulate matter  
21 form road traffic: A review, *Science of the Total Environment* 400, 270-282.  
22
- 23 Thurston, G.D., Liroy, P.J., 1987. Receptor modelling and aerosol transport, *Atmospheric*  
24 *Environment* 21, 687-698.  
25
- 26 Thurston, G.D., Spengler, J.D., 1985. A quantitative assessment of source contributions to  
27 inhalable particulate matter pollution in Metropolitan Boston, *Atmospheric Environment* 19,  
28 9-25.  
29
- 30 Tiwari, S., Srivastava, A.K., Bisht, D.S., Bano, T., Singh, S., Behura, S., Srivastava, M.K.,  
31 Chate, D.M., Padmanabhamurthy, B., 2009. Black carbon and chemical characteristics of  
32 PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> at an urban site of North India, *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry* 62, 193-  
33 209.  
34
- 35 Tripathi, R.M., Vinod Kumar, A., Manikandan, S.T., Bhalke, S., Mahadevan, T.N.,Puranik,  
36 V.D., 2004. Vertical distribution of atmospheric trace metals and their sources at Mumbai,  
37 India, *Atmospheric Environment* 38, 135-146.  
38
- 39 Tsai, Y.I., Chen, C., 2006. Atmospheric aerosol composition and source apportionments to  
40 aerosol in southern Taiwan, *Atmospheric Environment* 40, 4751-4763.  
41
- 42 USEPA, 1997. Chemical mass balance receptor model version 8(CMB8), user manual,  
43 Research Triangle Park, NC, Desert Research Institute, Reno, NV.  
44
- 45 Viana, M., Kuhlbusch, T.A.J., Querol, X., Alastuey, A., Harrison, R.M., Hopke, P.K.,  
46 Winiwarter, W., Vallius, M.,et al., 2008a. Source apportionment of particulate matter in  
47 Europe: A review of methods and results, *Journal of Aerosol Science* 39, 827-849.  
48

1 Viana, M., Pandolfi, M., Minguillón, M.C., Querol, X., Alastuey, A., Monfort, E., Celades, I.,  
2 2008b. Inter-comparison of receptor models for PM source apportionment: Case study in an  
3 industrial area, *Atmospheric Environment* 42, 3820-3832.  
4

5 Vijayanand, C., Rajaguru, P., Kalaiselvi, K., Selvam, K.P., Palanivel, M., 2008. Assessment  
6 of heavy metal contents in the ambient air of Coimbatore city, Tamil Nadu, India, *Journal of*  
7 *Hazardous Materials* 60, 548-553.  
8

9 Vincent K., Passant N., 2006. Assessment of heavy metal concentrations in the United  
10 Kingdom, AEA Technology, Available from [http://uk-](http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/reports/cat16/0604041205_heavy_metal_issue1_final.pdf)  
11 [air.defra.gov.uk/reports/cat16/0604041205\\_heavy\\_metal\\_issue1\\_final.pdf](http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/reports/cat16/0604041205_heavy_metal_issue1_final.pdf) [Accessed March  
12 29, 2011].  
13

14 Wahlin, P., 2003. COPREM: A multivariate receptor model with a physical approach,  
15 *Atmospheric Environment* 37, 4861–4867.  
16

17 Wang, G., Wang, H., Yu, Y., Gao, S., Feng J., Gao, S., Wang, L., 2003. Chemical  
18 characterization water-soluble components of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> atmospheric aerosols in five  
19 locations of Nanjing, China, *Atmospheric Environment* 37, 2893-2903.  
20

21 Watson, J.G., Zhu, T., Chow, J.C., Engelbrecht, J., Fujita, E.M., Wilson, W.E., 2002.  
22 Receptor modelling application framework for particle source apportionment, *Chemosphere*  
23 49, 1093-1136.  
24

25 Yatkin, S., Bayram, A., 2008. Source apportionment of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> using positive matrix  
26 factorization and chemical mass balance in Izmir, Turkey, *Science of The Total Environment*  
27 390, 109-123.  
28

29 Yin, J., Harrison, R. M., Chen, Q., Rutter, A., Schauer, J.J., 2010. Source apportionment of  
30 fine particles at urban background and rural sites in the UK atmosphere, *Atmospheric*  
31 *Environment* 44, 841-851.  
32

33 Zeng, F., Shi, G., Li, X., Fang, Y., Bi, X., Wu, J., Xue, Y., 2010. Application of a combined  
34 model to study the source apportionment of PM<sub>10</sub> in Taiyun, China, *Aerosol and Air Quality*  
35 *Research* 10,177-184.  
36

1 **TABLE CAPTIONS**

2 **Table 1:** Comparison between CMB and multivariate models (based upon Gordon, 1980;  
3 Henry et al., 1984; Thurston and Lioy, 1987; Harrison et al., 1997; USEPA,  
4 1997; Viana et al., 2008a; Zeng et al., 2010)

5  
6 **Table 2:** Source signatures used for source identification in Indian studies

7 **Table 3:** Heavy metal emission sources in the UK (Vincent and Passant, 2006; NAEI,  
8 2011)

9  
10

11

1 **Table 1:** Comparison between CMB and multivariate models (based upon Gordon, 1980;  
 2 Henry et al., 1984; Thurston and Liou, 1987; Harrison et al., 1997; Shrivastava et al., 2007;  
 3 USEPA, 1997; Viana et al., 2008a; Zeng et al., 2010)  
 4

<b>CMB Model</b>	<b>Multivariate Models</b>
<p>A key prerequisite is detailed information about the sources/emission inventories</p> <p>Only one sample is required</p> <p>Does not apportion the secondary aerosols</p> <p>Cannot take into account the time variation of the pollutant concentration or source emission</p> <p>Only non-reactive, stable tracer species can be used</p> <p>Near collinearity among source profiles can result in negative source contributions</p>	<p>Qualitative information about the potential sources is enough, useful for areas where detailed emission inventories are not available</p> <p>Require large numbers of samples</p> <p>Unable to account for spatial and temporal correlation between emissions (e.g. motor vehicle and road dust) or source identified may contain more than one source</p> <p>Often unable to produce a fine resolution of the sources</p> <p>Some of the models allow negative contributions to sources which is physically impossible (e.g. PCA)</p> <p>Information like met data, particle size etc can be incorporated in the analysis</p>

5  
6

1 **Table 2:** Source signatures used for source identification in Indian studies

Source Signature	Size fraction	Identified Source	City	Reference	
Na, Mg, K	SPM	Marine	Mumbai	Kumar et al. (2001)	
Na, K	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions		Mumbai	Kothai et al. (2008)	
Na, Cl	PM <sub>10</sub>		Mumbai	Chelani et al. (2008)	
K	SPM	Biomass burning	Delhi	Shridhar et al. (2010)	
K, NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		Jorhat	Khare and Baruah (2010)	
As, SO <sub>2</sub>	SPM	Coal combustion	Mumbai	Kumar et al. (2001)	
Co	TSP		Delhi	Srivastava and Jain (2007b)	
Picene	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata	Chowdhury et al. (2007)	
Te, S, Mn, Sn, Sb, SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> , Cd	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		Jorhat	Khare and Baruah (2010)	
Zn, Pb	TSP	Refuse/ solid waste burning	Bombay (Mumbai), Bangalore, Nagpur, Jaipur	Negi et al. (1987)	
TC, OC, NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	PM <sub>10</sub>		Kolkata	Karar and Gupta (2007)	
Cr, Ni	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions		Navi Mumbai	Kothai et al. (2008)	
Cu, Cr, Ni	PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub>		Agra	Kulshrestha et al. (2009)	
Zn, Pb	PM <sub>10</sub>		Delhi	Chelani et al. (2010)	
Coarse mode of Pb, Cr and fine mode of Pb, Cr, Ni	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions	Vehicular/industrial	Delhi	Balachandran et al. (2000)	
Cd, Cr, Ni, Pb	SPM		Delhi	Khillare et al. (2004)	
Pb, Co, Sb	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions		Navi Mumbai	Kothai et al. (2008)	
Co, Ni, Cu, Zn, Cd, Te	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		Jorhat	Khare and Baruah (2010)	
Zn, Cu, Br, V, Mn	TSP	Industrial	Bombay (Mumbai), Bangalore, Nagpur, Jaipur	Negi et al. (1987)	
Coarse and fine modes of Ni, Cd	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions		Delhi	Balachandran et al. (2000)	
Cu, Mn, Ni	SPM		Mumbai	Kumar et al. (2001)	
Fe, Se, Mo, Sb with low loading of Cr, V, Mn, Cu	PM <sub>10</sub>		Tirupati	Mouli et al. (2006)	
Mn, Cr	PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub>		Agra	Kulshrestha et al. (2009)	
Ni, Cd, Ba, Na	PM <sub>10</sub>		Delhi	Chelani et al. (2010)	
Ni, Cr, Mn, Cu, Zn, Pb	TSP		Delhi	Shridhar et al. (2010)	
Co, Cr, Zn, Cu, Ni	TSP		Kolkata	Kar et al. (2010)	
Pb	TSP		Vehicular	Bombay (Mumbai), Bangalore, Nagpur, Jaipur	Negi et al. (1987)
Pb, Cr, NO <sub>2</sub>	SPM			Mumbai	Kumar et al. (2001)
Cu, Pb, Cr	TSP	Delhi		Srivastava and Jain (2007b)	
Cr, Pb, Ni, Mn, Fe	PM <sub>10</sub>	Kolkata		Karar and Gupta (2007)	
Zn, S, BC	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions	Navi Mumbai		Kothai et al. (2008)	
Cu, Cr, Zn, Ni, Ca, Zn, Co	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions	Delhi		Srivastava et al. (2008)	
Cu, Zn, Pb	PM <sub>1</sub>	Kanpur		Chakrobarty and Gupta (2010)	
Pb, Ni, Mn, Zn, Cu	PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub>	Agra		Kulshrestha et al. (2009)	
Cu, Ni, Co, Cr, Ca	TSP	Delhi		Srivastava et al. (2009a)	
Zn	SPM	Mithapur		Basha et al. (2010)	
EC, OC, Zn	PM <sub>10</sub>	Delhi		Chelani et al. (2010)	
Al, Si, Ca, Ti	TSP	Bombay (Mumbai), Bangalore, Nagpur, Jaipur		Negi et al. (1987)	
Fine and coarse mode of Fe	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine			Delhi	Balachandran et al. (2000)

	fractions			
Fe, Al, Ca	SPM	Crustal dust/ road dust/ re-suspended dust	Mumbai	Kumar et al. (2001)
High loading of Fe	SPM		Delhi	Khillare et al. (2004)
Li, V, Cr, Mn, Ni, Co, Cu, Pb	PM <sub>10</sub>		Tirupati	Mouli et al. (2006)
Cl <sup>-</sup> , SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	PM <sub>10</sub>		Kolkata	Karar and Gupta (2007)
TC, OC, Fe	TSP (road dust)		Kolkata	Gupta et al. (2007)
OC, TC, Cl <sup>-</sup> , SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	TSP (soil dust)		Kolkata	Gupta et al. (2007)
Ni, Pb, Mn, Fe, Cu, Cd, Cr, Co	TSP		Delhi	Srivastava and Jain (2007b)
Fe, Cd, Zn, Ca, Cr, Ni, Mg, Ca	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions		Delhi	Srivastava et al. (2008)
Fe, Sc, Si, Ti, Ca	PM <sub>10</sub> divided into coarse and fine fractions		Navi Mumbai	Kothai et al. (2008)
Mn, Mg, Fe, Al, V, Co	PM <sub>10</sub>		Mumbai	Chelani et al. (2008)
Cr, Zn, Cd, Mg, Ca	TSP		Delhi	Srivastava et al. (2009a)
Ca, Mg, Fe, Pb with moderate loadings of Zn, Cr, V	PM <sub>1</sub>		Kanpur	Chakrobarty and Gupta (2010)
Fe, Ni, Zn, Pb	PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub>		Agra	Kulshrestha et al. (2009)
Al, Si, Ca, Ti	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		Jorhat	Khare and Baruah (2010)
Ca, Mg, Fe, Al, Mn	SPM		Delhi	Shridhar et al. (2010)
Pb, Cr, Co	SPM		Mithapur	Basha et al. (2010)
Fe, Cr, Mn, K <sup>+</sup>	PM <sub>10</sub>		Delhi	Chelani et al. (2010)
Ca, Co	TSP	Construction activities	Delhi	Srivastava and Jain (2007b)
Fe, Pb, Ni	PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub>		Agra	Kulshrestha et al. (2009)
Cd, V	SPM	Refuse oil burning	Delhi	Shridhar et al. (2010)

1

2 **Table 3:** Heavy metal emission sources in the UK (Vincent and Passant, 2006; NAEI, 2011)

Source type	Tracer elements
Coal combustion (domestic/industrial) +electric arc furnaces + coke ovens	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Mn, Mg, Ni, K, Se, Zn
Industrial emissions	Cd (copper alloy manufacture, Al, Zn production, galvanizing, lead acid battery industry), Cr (Production of Cr-based chemicals), Cu, Pb (industrial metal, lead-acid battery), Mn, Ni (Al production, refineries, copper alloy manufacture)
Fuel oil combustion	As, Cd, Cu, Mn, Ni, V
Iron and steel production	Cr, Pb, Mn, K, V, Zn
Road transport	Cu and Zn (tyre and brake wear), V (diesel)
Foundries	As, Cd, Pb, Ni
Waste burning/ incineration	Cd, Cu, Pb, Zn

3

4