Supporting Information: Research on Cluster Hollow Fiber Membrane Proton Transfer Reaction Mass Spectrometry

(CHFM-PTR-MS) and Its Application in Odorous Gas Detection

Feiyang Sun,^{†,‡,§} Xun Bao,^{†,§} Qiangling Zhang,^{†,*} Jie Jin,[†] Qian Xia,^{†,‡} Kexin Gu,^{†,‡} Qu Liang,[†] Wei Xu,[†] Xue Zou,[†] Chaoqun Huang,[†] Chengyin Shen,^{†,*} and Yannan Chu^{†,ζ}

§Feiyang Sun and Xun Bao contributed equally to this manuscript.

*Corresponding authors: Qiangling Zhang, e-mail: qlzhang@cmpt.ac.cn; Chengyin Shen, e-mail: chyshen@aiofm.ac.cn

[†]Anhui Province Key Laboratory of Medical Physics and Technology, Institute of Health and Medical Technology,

Hefei Institutes of Physical Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, 230031, P. R. China

[‡]University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, China

^ζHefei Cancer Hospital, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, 230031, P. R. China

Table of Contents

1. Table S1. Concentrations and uncertainties of the VOCs in standard gas
2.Figure S1. Mass spectrum of six test compounds detected by direct injection PTR-MS (<i>E/N</i> =167.3 Td)
3.Figure S2. Calibration curves of traditional direct injection PTR-MS
4.Figure S3. Mass spectrum comparison between CHFM-PTR-MS and direct injection PTR-MS
5.Figure S4. Calibration curves of traditional direct injection PTR-MS and CHFM-PTR-MS
6.Table S2. Improvement in sensitivity and LOD for other five test compoundsS6
7.Figure S5. Odorous gas application site and vehicle platform
8.Figure S6. Temperature and humidity during the application

Standard gas	Compound	Concentration (ppmv)	Uncertainty
1	Methyl Mercaptan	0.99	3%
	Methyl Sulfide	0.98	3%
	Carbon Disulfide	1.02	3%
	Ethyl Sulfide	0.95	3%
	Dimethyl Disulfide	0.98	3%
2	Methyl Acrylate	1.06	3%
	Ethyl Acrylate	1.07	3%
	Styrene	1.11	3%
	Cumene	1.12	3%

Table S1. Concentrations and uncertainties of the VOCs in standard gas



Figure S1. Mass spectrum of six test compounds detected by direct injection PTR-MS (E/N=167.3 Td). Air background had been deducted. Water cluster ions H₃O⁺(H₂O) and H₃O⁺(H₂O)₂ were skipped. From Figure S1, most of the tested compounds in the spectrum are dominated by protonated characteristic ions, except for cumene. Cumene contains many fragment ions under the current E/N condition, which is also the reason for its low sensitivity. Considering the detection sensitivity of most substances, we are unable to further reduce the E/N value. If only cumene needs to be detected in some certain scenarios, the E/N can be appropriately reduced to obtain a better sensitivity.



Figure S2. Calibration curves of traditional direct injection PTR-MS.



Figure S3. Mass spectrum comparison between CHFM-PTR-MS and direct injection PTR-MS. The detection concentration is 0.95-1.12 ppmv, and the mass ranges of the mass spectrum are m/z 20-125, skipping the H₃O⁺(H₂O).



Figure S4. Calibration curves of (a) traditional direct injection PTR-MS and (b) CHFM-PTR-MS.

Compound (m/z for MH ⁺)	Sensitivity (cps/ppbv)			LOD (ppbv)		
	ST	SD	SD/ST	LT	LD	LT/LD
Acetonitrile (42)	72.7	1072.6	14.8	0.174	0.017	10.2
Acetone (59)	107.3	947.4	8.8	0.445	0.053	8.4
Benzene (79)	7.7	79.2	10.3	2.642	0.176	15.0
Toluene (93)	11.9	125.4	10.5	0.850	0.088	9.7
<i>p</i> -xylene (107)	11.7	152.4	13.0	1.542	0.157	9.8

Table S2. Improvement in sensitivity and LOD for other five test compounds



Figure S5. Odorous gas application site (Left) and vehicle platform (Right). The location shown in the figure is the Interdisciplinary Research Building of the Hefei Institutes of Physical Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences. The red star marks the site of the odorous gas application, which is located at the waste disposal area outside the experimental building. The right side of the figure shows a schematic diagram of the vehicle platform, which includes the following components: (a) Battery. (b) HFM-PTR-MS. (c) Sampling head. (d) Temperature and humidity sensor.



Figure S6. Temperature and humidity during the application.