

# Laboratory Evaluation 2B Technologies Personal Ozone Monitor (POM)



# Background

Three **2B Technologies Personal Ozone Monitor (POM)** (units IDs: 1043, 1105 and 1106) were field-tested at the SCAQMD Rubidoux fixed ambient monitoring station (07/29/2015 to 09/09/2015) under ambient weather conditions. Now, three new POMs (units ID: 1148, 1122, 1141) have been evaluated in the SCAQMD Chemistry Laboratory under controlled ozone concentration, temperature, and relative humidity.

## 2B Technologies POM (3 units tested):



- Ozone sensors (**UV absorption, FEM**)
- Each unit measures: Ozone (ppb)  
**Unit cost: ~\$4,500**
- Time resolution: 10-sec to 1-hr
- Units IDs: 1148, 1122, 1141

## FRM instrument:

- Ozone FRM (Serinus 10, American Ecotech, Providence, RI)  
**Instrument cost: ~\$7,000**
- Time resolution: 1-min



# POM Linear Correlation Coefficient with FRM



- Three POM units tracked well with the ozone conc. change as recorded by FRM.
- POM units slightly underestimated the ozone conc. as recorded by FRM.
- In ozone concentration range of 0-350 ppb, the three POM units showed excellent correlation with the corresponding FRM data ( $R^2 > 0.99$ ) at 20 °C and 40% RH.

## POM Accuracy

- Accuracy (20 °C and 40% RH)

Steady State (#)	Sensor mean (ppb)	FRM (ppb)	Accuracy (%)
1	37.1	41.0	90.5
2	73.8	82.1	89.9
3	107.1	120.8	88.6
4	212.7	235.0	90.5
5	296.8	330.9	89.7


- The three POM units showed high accuracy compared to the FRM at 20 °C and 40% RH. Accuracy ranges from 89.7 to 90.5%.

## POM Data Recovery & Intra-model Variability

- Data recovery for ozone from 1148, 1122, and 1141 was 100%, 94.2%, and 100%, respectively.
- Low ozone measurement variations were observed among the three POM units at 20 °C and 40% RH.

# POM Precision


- Precision (Effect of ozone conc., temperature and relative humidity)




- The three POM units exhibited high precision during almost all tested conditions (ozone concentration, T and RH). POM 1122 experienced some instability at 5 °C, 40% RH and 20 °C, 65% RH.
- FRM's precision was also high across all conditions.

# POM Climate Susceptibility


2B POM vs FRM (Ozone Conc. Ramping; 5 °C, 15% RH)




2B POM vs FRM (Ozone Conc. Ramping; 35 °C, 15% RH)




2B POM vs FRM (Ozone Conc. Ramping; 5 °C, 65% RH)



2B POM vs FRM (Ozone Conc. Ramping; 35 °C, 65% RH)



# NO<sub>2</sub> Interferent



In the laboratory, the effect of NO<sub>2</sub> interferent is evaluated by exposing sensors to increasing concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> at 20 °C and 40% RH. As shown in the figure, both the FRM and sensors maintained their baseline readings throughout the NO<sub>2</sub> concentration ramping from 0 to 300 ppb.

# Discussion

- **Accuracy:** The three POM units showed high accuracy compared to the FRM at 20 °C and 40% RH. Accuracy ranges from 89.7 to 90.5%. (refer to slide 4)
- **Precision:** The three POM units exhibited high precision during almost all tested conditions (ozone concentration, T and RH). POM 1122 experienced some instability at 5 °C, 40% RH and 20 °C, 65% RH. (refer to slide 5 and 6)
- **Intra-model Variability:** Low ozone measurement variations were observed among the three POM units at 20 °C and 40% RH. (refer to slide 4)
- **Data Recovery:** Data recovery for ozone from 1148, 1122, and 1141 was 100%, 94.2%, and 100%, respectively. (refer to slide 4)
- **Baseline:** The three POM units reported baseline values close to 0 ppb.
- **Linearity of sensor response:** POM units showed excellent correlation/linear response with the corresponding FRM ozone measurement data ( $R^2 > 0.99$ ) between 0-400 ppb at 20 °C and 40% RH. (refer to slide 3)
- **Interferent:** Sensors were inert to NO<sub>2</sub> at 20 °C and 40% RH. When NO<sub>2</sub> was increased from 0 to 300 ppb, the sensors maintained their baseline readings.
- **Drift :** POM units had negligible drift over the course of laboratory testing.
- **Climate susceptibility:** During the laboratory testing, temperature and relative humidity had little effect on the sensor performance. (refer to slide 6)