

## ***Interactive comment on “Ozone, Carbon monoxide and Nitrogen oxides time series at four Alpine GAW mountain stations in Central Europe” by S. Gilge et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 20 September 2010

### **General evaluation**

In this paper are presented continuous data series of trace-gas mixing-ratios (ozone, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>) collected for several ten years at four GAW stations in the Alps and nearby. Special attention is devoted to long-term trends in yearly or monthly mean mixing ratios over periods of more than 10 years, and discussed in relation to primary emission changes in Europe and at the global scale.

Although this work provides no new major concept, it is nevertheless of undeniable value for the scientific community since long data series of ozone and two main pre-

C7724

cursors from four well-known Alpine observatories are for the first time presented and discussed in a common and consistent way. As result, this work is an interesting synthesis, which supports a number of ideas raised in many previous papers focused on only one site and/or only one gas. Finally, it draws a general portrait of the evolution of the background low troposphere in central Europe over the last decades, and brings elements of discussion on the causes of this evolution.

Globally, the paper is well structured and well written. Most discussions are clear and convincing and the conclusions are in general well argued. In such a work, the comparability of data in time and space is a key point. Accordingly, a considerable attention was paid to the question of data quality assurance, as well as traceability and comparability of the used calibration standards. The authors thus provide many details (Section 2) which are perhaps not of interest for all readers, but are nevertheless needed. The data series, as well as simple but well chosen statistics derived from the data, are objectively described in Section 3, then discussed in Section 4 in relation to primary emission changes and particular source areas (when well identified). The results are well synthesized in the concluding Section 5.

I have however one major comment concerning the use and interpretation of statistical tests in this study (see in general comments below). Nevertheless this is mostly a question of presentation of the results, which can be easily improved simply by changing the text, but no further scientific work is needed.

Finally, as this paper is an interesting scientific contribution and suffers from no major deficiencies, I recommend its publication in ACP after consideration of minor changes suggested below.

### **General comments**

#### **Paper length**

C7725

The manuscript is a bit lengthy, due to (i) the need of a very detailed description of the data quality assurance methods, (ii) a great number of figures, and (iii) the authors' choice to first present the results (section 3) and then discuss them in a separate section (4). I think however that all these reasons are justified. As I wrote above, data quality assurance is a key element of this study. The figures are well chosen and clearly organized, and all bring interesting information. The chosen sectioning perhaps renders the text a bit longer than it could be, but also makes it clearer. For these reasons I think it would be hard to make the manuscript significantly shorter without loss of interesting information or clarity. Therefore I encourage the authors to make the text more concise wherever possible, but without removing scientific stuff or changing the structure.

### **Use and interpretation of statistical tests**

In many places in the paper the authors provide results of a statistical test briefly described in Section 2.4. Even I have no doubt the authors interpret the test correctly, I wonder whether using such a statistical test is appropriate in this study. At least, it might be confusing for readers not familiar with statistical tests. I would like the authors consider the four comments below:

1) As far as I know, statistical tests are usually used to control a risk of mistake, and reject results having too high risk of occurrence by chance. In the present study (linear regressions on time series), I would have expected an evaluation of the risk (probability) of inferring the existence of a trend (or more precisely, a degree of linear correlation) although there is actually no correlation (the latter statement being the "null hypothesis" of the test, ie. what is tested in fact). In case of a probability less than 5%, the existence of the found correlation is considered to be statistically significant; it is statistically non-significant in the opposite case (by the way, I suggest to change "insignificant" into "non-significant" throughout the paper). Here, the authors use a criterium of probability  $>95\%$ . This is certainly an equivalent formulation of the test, but this is unusual and moreover they do not explicit the probability of what it is (see my specific comment

C7726

below). So I encourage the authors to clarify all this.

2) I can understand the use of a statistical test in a normative and/or objective context (eg. in a standardized protocol, an algorithm, etc.) but here the authors present test results as qualitative indications to inform the reader on the robustness of the linear regression results. This information is not ambiguous for significant or highly-significant results, but in many places the authors mention (and even discuss) non-significant trends. I am in trouble with this. What the reader is supposed to think in this case? Do the authors trust in their result, or not? Without further information than "non-significance", the reader can come to no conclusion on the existence of linear correlation. However, in some cases a conclusion might be nevertheless possible and of interest for the reader. If the probability of the null hypothesis (no linear correlation) is 10

3) To avoid such ambiguity, alternatively or additionally to statistical tests, the authors could provide the 95%-confidence interval associated to the calculated variation rate. In the present discussion paper, uncertainties are sometimes given associated with variation rates (but not always), however, it is not said if these are 95%-confidence intervals or standard deviations. This should be at least clarified, but I also strongly encourage the authors to go further and provide systematically, for each linear regression they mention, the variation rate associated with its 95% confidence interval. In this way the information on the robustness of the result would be more intuitive and less confusing or subject to misinterpretations.

4) In Figures 4,5,9,10,13,14, and 18, are the linear trends calculated based on yearly or monthly statistics? This is an important question, because the statistical significance level strongly depends on the number of data points. Significance levels of trends based on monthly statistics might be found greater than for trends based on yearly statistics, although using the same underlying data set.

### **Figures in general**

C7727

They are all very clear and of good quality, however some are too small and details very tiny. Please enlarge the figures to use the full text width.

### Specific comments

p.19072

l.18-19 "with a tendency to higher ... trends in summer" and l.21-22 "whereas the highest ... in summer, respectively": the statements are redundant and partly inconsistent. Please revise the text.

p.19074

l.4-5: the reference to Novelli et al. 2003 could be added to the list of cited papers.

l.15-17: "Different impacts" of what? This sentence is very vague, please precise.

p.19075

l.9 "separate (...) boundary layer and free troposphere conditions": I don't like the underlying idea that low ground stations are in the boundary layer, and high-altitude stations are in the free-troposphere (at least sometimes). Such statements are common in the scientific literature, but this is an oversimplifying view:

- First, this implicitly assumes that the continental boundary layer is a flat structure with more or less the same depth everywhere, and that sufficiently high summits emerge above its top - like islands from the sea. However this image is not true, especially in mountain areas, where the convective boundary layer is very inhomogeneous and show very specific structures evolving along the day. Convective motions above summits and crests can reach altitude much above the top of the boundary layer developing in the same time over the surrounding flat lowlands and inject air from lower layers into the local free troposphere (concept of "mountain injection layer"). Further, even in non convective conditions,  
C7728

strong vertical motion and turbulence might be enhanced in mountain areas due to terrain roughness.

- Second, the idea that certain stations are representative of the boundary layer, and other ones of the free troposphere, assumes that the composition of each layer is more or less homogeneous, but this is not the case, especially in the free troposphere. Therefore "boundary layer and free-tropospheric conditions" means little without further precision of time and space scales, as well as altitude.

Despite all this, a high-altitude ground-based station might in certain conditions provide measurements representative of the composition of the free troposphere at similar altitude levels above surrounding flat lands, providing one defines carefully what is meant under "free-tropospheric composition", in terms of averaging time intervals and space volumes, altitude range, etc.

Finally, I suggest the authors could here change their sentence into something like "... enables to separate local and regional effects, and provide data more or less influenced by the surface, and in some cases representative, for certain time and space scales, of the free troposphere at similar altitude levels above the surrounding lowlands."

p.19076

l.9: It could be precised that the "surrounding countryside" is rather flat and the HPB mountain quite isolated, so that the image of an island emerging above the boundary layer might be more true for HPB in very stable atmospheric conditions, than for the high-altitude sites, embedded in mountain chains.

l.24 and 26: Please explain briefly what "global" and "regional" mean for GAW stations.

l.26 "The GAW regional site (...) is freely advected from all sides.": I can understand what the authors mean, but the sentence sounds strange: how could a station be advected? This should be rephrased more properly.

p.19078

I.23: Why, with the same technique (NDIR), is the uncertainty of CO measurements at JFJ much smaller than at the other stations?

p.19079

I.14: Please explain what a round robin is in this context.

p.19080

I.4 "the higher concentrated mixture": Do the authors mean the 40-ppm mixture?

p.19082

I.5: What does the indicated time (1s) stand for?

p.19083

I.3-5: I guess a "PRM" (also in Table 2) is a standard gas, but could this be precised? Besides, how well does this standard compare with the NOAA standard?

I.14-24: It should be more explicitly written here that ozone background concentrations increase with increasing altitude, and that the ZSF ozone data were offset to compensate the altitude difference between ZSF and ZUG, and reconnect appropriately the data series to the previous ZUG data.

p.19084

I.14-19: Three points should be clarified in the description of the statistical test:

1) The cited reference (Sachs, 1992) is in German and hardly accessible by most readers. Please give an alternative reference in English. If this is not possible, the method should be explained in details.

2) It seems that "r" is the correlation coefficient (Pearson?) of a linear regression, but please, precise it.

3) I.17: the probability of what? (possibly here: the probability of having  $|t| < \hat{t}$ , where  $t$  is an occurrence from a T-distribution centred on zero, representing the null hypothesis.) Please precise this, as well as an interpretation of the corresponding condition.

p.19085

C7730

I.2-5: Why (especially for the longest time series) were linear trends estimated over the whole time periods of data availability, whereas it was said (p.19074, I.10-12) that ozone rapidly increased until the early 1990s then levelled off thereafter. Would not be more relevant to calculate linear trends until e.g. 1995 for the first increase phase, then discuss the second phase from 1995 as it is already the case (Fig.3)?

I.14-15: Why are no summer maxima observed at these sites? Could this be explained by different site characteristics or environments compared to the DACH sites?

I.28-29 "None of the percentile series show a significant trend.": Is it also the case if the linear regressions are based on monthly percentiles? (See also the general comment on significance levels, item 4.)

p.19086

I.23, "ZSF": Should not one read "ZUG" instead (cf. 2.3.4)?

p.19087

I.4, "logically": Why is it logical that the trend calculated from the baseline data (Zellweger et al. 2009) is less rapid than from unfiltered data? Please explain briefly. Beyond this, in this sentence "higher" obviously means that the decrease is more rapid, but this is perhaps not the most appropriate adjective for a trend.

I.8, please remove "as they are".

p.19088

I.14: "anthropogenic impact": I would precise "regional".

p.19089

I.13-16 and caption of Fig.16: It is not clear how the "relative abundance of gas weighted by frequency of wind direction" is calculated. Is it obtained as the product of the wind frequency and the mean gas concentration in a given 10°-sector, then normalized by the mean gas concentration over all directions? Please clarify.

I.18 and Fig.17 (right panel): Does the wind distribution in this figure mix data from both

C7731

ZUG and ZSF? This would make little sense, as ZUG lies on the top of the mountain and ZSF on its southern slope. I expect the influence of the topography and in turn the wind angular distribution are very different at these two stations. In this case, two figures for ZUG and ZSF should be shown and discussed separately.

p.19091

l.2 "footprint area": I am afraid this is not understandable by all reader, please explain. Also, the term "catchment area" (ie. the area from where the emissions influencing the station are caught) might be better.

l.15 "except for summer where the factor is 1.2": As JFJ is situated in a very touristic area, do the authors think that enhanced local traffic in summer, especially during week-ends, could play a role?

p.19092

l.2-14: How robust are the discussed trends?

l.7-8 "the shift in ... individual sectors": this sentence is unclear to me, please rephrase.

l.9 and 14: "significant" might be confusing here. Is the term used in its statistical or general meaning?

l.21 "in the range between insignificant and -5%/yr": a significance level and a variation rate are inconsistent with each other, please rephrase. Beyond this, it assumes that a non significant result should be interpreted as an absence of trend. This is not true, see the related general comment.

l.24 - p.10093, l.20: This discussion assumes that proportionality should be expected between the changes in European NO<sub>2</sub> emissions and ambient concentrations at the stations. This is strictly valid only if there is zero background concentration at the hemispheric scale and if all sources influencing a station have changed in the same proportions. This is not the case, actually. Could the authors discuss the link between emissions and expected concentrations further? In particular, is there a non-negligible

C7732

large-scale background of NO<sub>2</sub> due to reservoir species of NO<sub>x</sub> (HNO<sub>3</sub>, PAN, etc.), and if so, how is it changing on the long term?

p.10093

l.24: Again, "significant" is a confusing term in the context of this paper.

p.19094

l.1-2: "mainly due to the annual cycle of (...) OH radicals": could the authors cite a reference?

l.28 - p.19095, l.3: This paragraph is a bit confusing. If there is no decrease of the vertical mixing, how to explain the increase of the CO vertical gradient? Beyond this, HPB and JFJ are quite far from each other: could one really infer a conclusion on the evolution of the vertical CO gradient? I think vertical comparisons should be made between closer sites, eg. ZUG and HPB, or JFJ and a NABEL site in Switzerland.

p.19095

l.16 "-0.84 ppb/yr": This result is difficult to compare with the values above. It should be also given in %/yr.

l.16-20: These two sentences are confusing, please clarify.

l.21-22: This seems contradictory: how could the low sites in Switzerland (I guess, on the northern side of the Alps?) be more impacted by Italian emissions than JFJ?

p.19096

l.2 "as presented in Sect.3": The authors could precise: in Fig.9.

l.11-12 "depending on source areas": It is vague. Where are these source areas?

p.19097

l.9 "declining": do the authors mean "lower"?

p.19098

l.3-5: Again, one cannot infer the absence of trend from a non significant result, but

C7733

this idea is underlying beyond this sentence. This should be rephrased.

p.19099

l.13: In the cited references, are the found trends positive or negative?

l.22 "higher elevated atmospheric composition": Do the authors mean "atmosphere composition at higher elevations"? Higher than what?

p.19100

l.5-12: See above my specific comment on p.19092, l.24.

l.19 "results are not consistent": It is not clear which results are referred to.

l.29: The study by Kaiser et al. 2010 is not in the reference list. Please precise if it is a paper in preparation.

p.19111, Fig.2: Are the averaged values calculated over a common time period? Please precise which one(s).

p.19127, Fig.18: To be consistent with the structure of Section 4, the panels for NO<sub>2</sub> should appear in second row.

### Technical corrections

p.19074

l.27-29: This sentence looks badly constructed ("mapping", "but are not influenced?"). Please rephrase. Moreover, is "Therefore" appropriate? I see no clear causal relationship with the preceeding sentence.

l.28: "larger" misspelled.

p.19075

l.21 "Current": "Up-to-date"?

C7734

p.19079

l.15: For clarity, "as occasional checks" could be moved to the end of the sentence.

p.19083

l.9: Please rephrase to read "The station was audited ..." l.14: Unexpected " after 100ppb. l.19: "Zugspitze" misspelled.

p.19087

l.3-5: The opening parenthesis just before "JFJ" (l.3) should be logically closed by the one just after "Zellweger et al., 2009" (l.5). Please remove the parentheses in between.

p.19089

l.12, "Fig. 17-18": One should probably read "Fig. 16-17" instead.

p.19092

l.10-11 "different from JFJ": "unlike at JFJ" might be better.

p.19096

l.21: "has been" could be removed.

p.19097

l.8: This sentence looks badly constructed ("The circumstances ... is supported ..."), please rephrase.

p.19099

l.8: I would use "Although" instead of "As".

l.11 "constant": "unchanging"?

p.19101

l.14: bad reference, please modify to read "doi:10.1029/2007JD009751".

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 19071, 2010.

C7735