

Interactive comment on “Technical Note: Formal blind intercomparison of HO₂ measurements in the atmosphere simulation chamber SAPHIR during the HOxComp campaign” by H. Fuchs et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 19 October 2010

This paper presents a comparison of HO₂ measurements made in ambient air and within the SAPHIR large simulation chamber by three different instruments operated by different research groups. The manuscript describes the campaign approach, experiments performed and compares the measurements obtained using each system; the intercomparison was performed in a formal blind manner. The paper is closely related to Schlosser et al., ACP, 2009, which described the intercomparison of OH measurements performed in the same campaign.

HO_x radical measurements are technically challenging, and formal blind intercomparison exercises such as these are essential to the confidence of the community in related

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

ambient observations. The manuscript should make a substantial contribution to our understanding of the reliability of atmospheric HO_x measurements performed using the LIF approach.

The topic of the paper is suitable for publication in ACP. The paper is generally well written, and I recommend publication, after the comments below are satisfactorily addressed.

-As no absolute HO₂ measurement was available, the analysis is necessarily restricted to comparing the relative HO₂ values obtained by the different instruments. As the basic approach used was the same in each case (LIF detection of OH following HO₂ conversion through addition of NO) concern may remain that the absolute accuracy of HO₂ measurements has not been tested. This is noted in the manuscript, and is unavoidable given the experimental issues with MIESR, but should be more clearly flagged in the abstract and conclusions.

-Nighttime data. The ambient measurements (e.g. Fig 2) seem to agree better during the day than during the night; in the manuscript (p. 21204 line 16) it is stated that "...the nighttime data are discussed separately", but this discussion does not appear to be present. The nighttime data should be explicitly considered in the paper, and the correlations / regression between the instruments during the night included in tables 3 and 4 (either collectively as all ambient data, or distinguished by day/night).

-Instrument calibration details: Table 1 presents a summary of the instrument parameters, but it might be useful to include the typical laser fluence used in each system (which would directly relate to any interference effect), and to specify the NO used (supplier, purity etc) in each case. The estimated accuracy of each instrument is also given in table 1, and the regression slopes between the instruments are compared with these values in the text. This is fine but I wonder if some of the systematic uncertainties in the estimated accuracy values will be common to some of the instruments – e.g. water vapour absorption cross sections – and so slightly better agreement might be

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



expected than these values (in isolation) indicate ?

The calibration approaches used differ in that some systems used added excess CO while others use the increase in HOx signal upon addition of NO. For the instruments which used both, did the calibration constants for HO₂ derived from added excess CO agree with those obtained from the (increase in) HOx signal when NO was added to the sampled air ? One might expect a difference, if calibration tube and/or inlet losses of OH and HO₂ differ, which might then feed into the measurement difference (as OH, HO₂ are typically present at comparable levels during calibration, but HO₂ » OH in ambient air).

p. 21213 line 18 mentions that different calibration constants were used for the ambient and chamber measurements – how different ? Is this indicative of calibration drift which might influence the comparisons (relating to discussion on p. 21208) or were the instrument configurations simply slightly different. P.21214 line 16 states that the same calibration factors were applied ?

Ozone interference – What humidity is the 0.07 ppt interference per 50 ppb O₃ determined for (p. 21198) in the FZJ instrument, and how does this compare with the humidity levels experienced during the campaign ? Considering the laser fluence (see above) would a larger or smaller interference be expected for the other systems ?

Humidity dependence of calibration. Some (other) LIF systems are known to show a greater than expected (from quenching alone) sensitivity dependence upon H₂O, which has previously been attributed (rather loosely) to HO₂.H₂O cluster formation in the expansion. The observed humidity-dependence to the HO₂ data (e.g. Fig 11) is interesting and suggests that this effect, or possibly some interaction between HO₂, H₂O and NO, may be occurring in some of the systems – this would then explain the difference in humidity-dependence agreement for HO₂, not observed for OH. It may be useful to compare the humidity dependence of the HO₂ observations reported here with that observed for OH in Schlosser et al.

Diurnal profiles, figure 2: The morning HO₂ rise (on 9/7/05) seems to be more closely correlated with the rise in O₃ than the fall in NO, as stated in the text. May indicate NO-driven cycling of RO₂-HO₂-OH rather than simply NO acting as an HO₂ sink.

Figure 8, why are there so few datapoints, esp. for the third panel – the ambient timeseries (e.g. Fig 6) seems to include many more data points.

p.21206 lines 14+ - it is unclear here which data are included – all ambient or daytime only ? First night or both nights ?

p.21209 line 24 The O₃ levels are actually somewhat different between the time periods mentioned (10 vs 40-50 ppb).

p.21213 last line – the ambient OH data shown in Schlosser et al. seem to be in fairly consistent relationship between instruments. One might expect OH, with a shorter chemical lifetime, to show a stronger dependence upon inhomogeneous mixing than HO₂.

Conclusions – related to the point above, the nighttime data differ substantially between instruments. I would like to see a slightly more critical consideration of these data included in the concluding remarks that there was “good correlation between ambient air data”.

Other points

-Please give dates of the HO_xCOMP campaign

-define SAPHIR where first used

-Ascarite – give IUPAC name

-Table 3, 4 the distinction between the SAPHIR and SAPHIR* results could be clearer

Typos

p.21196 line 25 needs rewording

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

A number of the references seem to have extra numbers after the publication year.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 21189, 2010.

ACPD

10, C8876–C8880, 2010

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C8880

