Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, C5683–C5685, 2010 www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/10/C5683/2010/ © Author(s) 2010. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



ACPD

10, C5683–C5685, 2010

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Source identification and

budget analysis on elevated levels of formaldehyde within ship plumes: a photochemical/dynamic model analysis" by C. H. Song et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 23 July 2010

This manuscript reports a modeling study of the impact of ship emissions on the marine boundary layer CH2O levels. This study utilized a photochemical box model with an implemented Gaussian dispersion scheme that has been used in several previous ship plume studies. The authors conducted simulations to investigate the relative importance of three CH2O sources, i.e., CH4 oxidation, ship emission, and oxidation of ship emitted NMVOC. These simulations were designed to represent various atmospheric conditions at various latitudes and under different atmospheric stabilities. In



Discussion Paper



conclusion, the authors suggested that the enhanced shipping corridor CH2O level can mostly be attributed the CH4 oxidation by elevated OH levels, which is, in turn, a direct result of ship emissions of NOx. The manuscript is generally well organized and the research method appears to be reasonable. This reviewer, however, has a serious concern about the major conclusion. The authors should re-examine their work and provide better explanations before the final publication of this manuscript.

The authors have stated the emission ratios for various NMVOC species in Table 1. The C>4 Alkane species have the highest values. It would be very helpful for the readers to know the magnitude of the ship emission impact on various NMVOC species. i.e., the simulated mixing ratios for each NMVOC species. Based on the levels given in Table 3, the rate of NMVOC reaction with OH would be a significant fraction of the CH4 oxidation rate. The reaction rate coefficients are 3 - 4 orders of magnitudes higher for the NMVOC reactions than that for CH4. The CH2O yield (mostly through Acetaldehyde) can be significantly higher than unity. Thus, it is not easy to understand why the difference between case I and II is not observable in Figures 3 and 4. In addition, freshly emitted CH2O can be a net source of HOx. It is desirable for the authors to show the OH values for all three cases. As for the NMVOC contribution, the authors should conduct a detailed budget analysis for CH2O, including a budget for CH3O2 and CH3OOH to show the relative contributions from NMVOC and CH4 and direct CH2O formation throughout the NMVOC degradation steps. Based on the background mid-latitude conditions given in Table 3, a quick box-model calculation gives NMVOC contribution in the order of 10%. The equation (3) cited in the manuscript is neither rigorous nor practical (see details in specific comments). The term Φ is rather difficult to determine as it is a function of chemical conditions. Finally, the authors should also consider the background Acetone and Ketone in the analysis, since oxidation of these species can be a non-negligible source of CH2O.

Specific Comments:

Page 4, line 22: "the removal of CH4 can also ...", is this an over-simplified statement?

ACPD

10, C5683-C5685, 2010

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Page 5, paragraph 2: This paragraph really casts doubts on if there is a CH2O enhancement in the ship traffic corridor. The authors should re-organize this paragraph and clarify their points.

Page 7, ling 16/17: OPE is not a direct observation.

Page 8, paragraph 1: The authors should provide more detailed discussions on the comparison between model and observations, shown in Figure 2. It should be pointed out that the level of agreement is different for different species and ship plume transects.

Page 11, line 8: "O(1D) radicals mainly react with the more \dots " This is not correct, the main losses for O(1D) are the reactions with O2 and N2.

Page 16, equation (3): This is equation is incorrect since there are important feedback reactions after CH3O2 + HO2 and CH3O2 + CH3O2, which will produce CH2O. The authors should have some discussion on the values of the CH2O yield from the key NMVOC species from ship emissions. This equation should be revised or deleted. A better definition of NMVOC contributions is need for the manuscript. The authors should trace sources of CH3O2 and CH3OOH in terms of relative contribution from NMVOC and CH4 oxidations.

Page 37, Table 3: The CO levels appear to be very high for the tropical case! The authors are referred to check NASA PEM-Tropics A and B observations. The other CO values are more consistent with the polluted regions. This reviewer questions if the authors should show the ship emission impact in polluted environments?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 15441, 2010.

10, C5683-C5685, 2010

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

