

Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on “Aerosol optical properties and radiative forcing in the high Himalaya based on measurements at the Nepal Climate Observatory – pyramid site (5100 m a.s.l)” by S. Marcq et al.***

**S. Marcq et al.**

laj@lgge.obs.ujf-grenoble.fr

Received and published: 11 May 2010

Anonymous Referee #3

This paper describes the diurnal and seasonal optical properties of aerosols sampled at a high-elevated site in Himalaya and estimate the aerosol radiative forcing for the different seasons and for several air-masses origins. It is an interesting paper worth publishing but several minor points have to be worked out more carefully.

General comments: It is not clear throughout the whole manuscript what the relative

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



humidity of the sampled air is. In the abstract it is not mentioned if the reported single scattering albedo is for dry or ambient conditions. In the “site and instrument description” section, the RH of the measured aerosol is not given. In the paragraph describing the total and back scattering coefficients (pages 5634 and 5635), Nessler et al. (2005) dealing with the effect of humidity on the absorption coefficient is cited (procedure for high humidity) but not the Nessler et al. paper concerning the scattering coefficient. It is not clear if the procedures cited are used to correct dry measurement for ambient RH, as described by Nessler et al. In the result section, it is mentioned that the relative humidity in the nephelometer is not controlled (p.5642 lines 14). The applied measuring and correcting procedures have to be well defined. The impact of the RH variation on the seasonal cycle of the scattering coefficient and of the single scattering albedo has to be discussed.

This was clarified in the manuscript which was indeed confusing. We made it clear that all information referring to single scattering albedo and given in text, figures and table are dry SSAs. The RH correction made using both Nessler papers (second paper now referenced) was only applied for the GAME code calculation. This is now indicated in Section 5.1. The RH in the TSI Neph never exceeded 30%. We can therefore consider SSA to correspond to dry conditions without applying further corrections accounting for hygroscopic growth. This is clarified in Section 2.

the Nephelometer is on the PM<sub>2.5</sub> inlet and the MAAP on the PM<sub>10</sub> inlet. It is important to discuss the resulting error induced on the single scattering albedo and the direct radiative forcing.

This is right and we have now changed the text accordingly. We now explain in detail why using different inlets does not induce any significant error in  $w_0$ . The good correlation between EC and BC shown in Marinoni et al. (2010) and Decesari et al. (2010) at the NCO-P site shows, in fact, that light absorption is dominated by carbonaceous material which is predominantly in the sub-micron fraction. The use of different cut-size for Nephelometer and MAAP inlets will therefore not affect values.

in the second section, the 4 seasons are described as pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon and winter. In the other section, the summer season and the dry season are also mentioned. Can you please use only one denomination for clarity purpose?

We have modified the manuscript to make it homogeneous

The special events are not really well described. Can elevated concentrations of particles be also due to regional pollution? When are these SE more frequent? A small description of the “large scale changes” discussed by Bonasoni et al. 2010 would be appreciated.

Same comment as Reviewer #1. We have now clearly indicated the criteria for selecting SEs. The frequency of SE with seasons is given in the text and we believe correspondance with Bonasoni et al. 2010 classification is clearly explained.

The most commonly used abbreviation for the single scattering albedo is !0 (instead of W). This has been changed throughout the manuscript

in §4 AOD is used and in §5 AOT ! This is now changed

figure captions are missing. This is due to an editing error that should be solved

sometimes pre-monsoon is written with a capital letter and sometimes not. This is now made homogeneous throughout the manuscript

Specific comments:

p. 5629 line 16: dry or ambient single scattering albedo ? See comment before: this is now clarified

p. 5630 lines 17-20: rephrase, not clear. The sentence was modified

P. 5630 line23: not only to scatter but also . . . This has been corrected

P.5630 lines24-26: does BC originates mostly from incomplete combustion ? brown carbon should perhaps also be mentioned. It is now mentioned in the text

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

page 5631 lines 15-17: not very clear for me. Could you give some precisions ? The sentence was changed

page 5631 lines 17-20: increased precipitation lead to a decrease of the aerosol load over India. What is then the effect on the radiative forcing ? (if mentioned in Lau and Kim, since this is clearly not the results presented in the paper). The whole section was rephrased to clarify

P. 5634 line 1. site and instruments description. Corrected

p.5635 line 7: limited the measurement record to the following periods:. . . corrected

p. 5635 line 20 to p. 5636 line 2: a lot of similar information is in both paragraphs. It is also not necessary to indicate the number of 5-min samples. This was removed

P. 5640 lines11-13: This phenomenon was already discussed elsewhere ? The phrase was modified

P. 5640 line 16. 2 verbs in the main sentence! Corrected

P. 5641 lines 5-6: scavenging also explains the weak (please not week!!) diurnal cycle as explained on lines 20-21 for the absorption coefficient cycle. This is right. We added this explanation in the text

P. 5641 line 10. does NOT show any influence. . . ? corrected

P. 5643 lines 26-28:This is also seen for all other parameters related to optical and chemical properties. corrected

P. 5644 line 14: higher values than what ? This sentence seems not very clear to me. The sentence was rephrased

P. 5644 line16: the variability is probably not difficult to explain (see error bars of figure 1). But the similarity between BG and RP seems difficult to explain to me! This is right: the sentence was rephrased

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

P. 5644 line20: EC may be used for the first time This is now corrected

§4.3: why is the asymmetry factor  $g$  not described? We clarified the  $g$  was only used in the GAME code and therefore not discussed

P. 5645 line 14: divides the atmosphere into several layers Corrected

P. 5647 lines 2-5: you discuss actually BOA briefly on page 5648. Why don't you discuss  $F(\text{TOA})$  ? Brackets are inexistent in table 2. Table=2 is not correct. This is now explained in the text.  $F(\text{TOA})$  values are indicated as an indicator of a balanced heat budget in the model but clearly, is of limited scientific relevance.

P. 5647 line 10: instead is misused. Corrected

P. 5647 line 19: Do you have an explanation why the radiative impact is larger during the pre-monsoon season? Is the global aerosol load larger before the monsoon? Yes: we clarified it in the text

P 5648 line 17: table 3 does not exist in the paper. This is now corrected

Table 2: the different radiation forcing are not well described in the caption (in the text it is ok), for example  $F_s$  is not described. The table caption was completed

Figure 1: why are the standard deviation for scattering and absorption coefficient larger in March-April and the single scattering albedo one in June-August? Standard deviations for scattering and absorption coefficient are high during pre-Monsoon because of the higher frequency of highly concentrated episodes. Because  $w_0$  is the relative proportion of abs. with respect to scat., there is no reason to have the higher variability at the same time. Higher variability of  $w_0$  during the monsoon period reflects the variability in absorbing carbon content. No change was made in the manuscript for this comment.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 5627, 2010.