

Interactive comment on “Optical-microphysical properties of Saharan dust aerosols and composition relationship using a multi-wavelength Raman lidar, in situ sensors and modelling: a case study analysis” by A. Papayannis et al.

A. Papayannis et al.

apdlidar@central.ntua.gr

Received and published: 29 March 2012

Respond to Reviewer's #1 comments (please also see Annotated Manuscript, where corrections/additions are given in green text).

We would like first to thank the reviewer for his valuable comments.

p. 25475: Abstracts should also include the major findings (numbers!). How strong was the Saharan dust event? Provide some AOT values, etc. Following reviewer's suggestion the abstract has been totally revised including the major finding with numbers for

C16272

AOT, Lidar Ratio, Ångström Exponent and Refractive Indices.

p. 25475-25746: Introduction: The first paragraph is rather boring, and the second paragraph begins with a questionable statement. How can lidar observations reduce the uncertainty in radiative modelling? May be CALIPSO can do this job, but a ground-based, low-density continental lidar network? Instead: Why not reviewing the existing lidar work with focus on desert dust and mixed dust (Europe, America, Asia), and the potential of lidar in this field and afterwards: what are the gaps, the open questions: and how this paper contributes to this field of research. Following reviewer's suggestion, the reviewing of the existing lidar work with focus on desert dust and mixed dust (Europe, America, Asia), and the potential of lidar in this field and what are the gaps, the open questions: and how this paper contributes to this field of research, has been performed and references are provided (see the first 4 paragraphs).

p. 25478: How large are the uncertainties of the other lidar quantities? Extinction coefficient, lidar ratio, Angstrom values? Following reviewer's suggestion, the uncertainties of the other lidar quantities are now provided both in manuscript (section 2) and Figure 5.

p. 25479: Errors are mentioned in the case of MODIS, but not in the case of AERONET! Following reviewer's suggestion, errors are now mentioned in the case of MODIS and AERONET (sections 2.2 and 2.3).

p. 25482: The unknown shape characteristics and the consequences for inversion retrievals using lidar backscatter coefficients needs to be discussed in more detail. Gasteiger (Tellus 2011, SAMUM) obviously shows that progress is made, but the use of a simplified spheroid model is still combined with large uncertainties. The shape problem is not solved, although the results (presented later on) are reasonable. This was further shown by Gasteiger for volcanic ash also (ACP). So, this remains a basic problem. Should be mentioned.

Following reviewer's suggestion, we have added the requested text in the second para-

C16273

graph of section 2.5.

p. 25483: Furthermore, the basic problem of inversions is the ill-posed situation. Unique (unambiguous) solutions will never be available. The size distribution (radius? diameter?) is ranging from 0.075 to 20 microns in the case of lidar. What is the size range of inversion in the case of AERONET? Please clarify and mention the range used by AERONET, too. Before discussing the results of atmospheric modelling, one should state (again) how complex the aerosol conditions in the Mediterranean are, especially over southern Greece. High pollution (urban haze), marine particles everywhere, sometimes biomass burning events, and Saharan dust. Model results are more or less speculative at such conditions. Should be commented. Modelling is a crucial job in these regions. Following reviewer's suggestion we have discussed furthermore the basic problem of inversions as an ill-posed situation, giving non unique solutions (1st paragraph of section 2.5). Also we added the size distribution used by AERONET (end of section 2.2). The 6th paragraph of section 2.5 treats the fact of how complex the aerosol conditions in the Mediterranean are, especially over southern Greece.

p. 25484: Surface measurements in Athens (influenced by sea breeze effects, lofted dust layers, urban haze from surrounding countries) linked to profile observations, does that make sense?! Can such observations at ground be compared with lidar observations (focus on lofted, widely decoupled dust)? What do you expect from such comparisons? Some critical statements will improve the message of the paper. Figure 2 presents backward trajectories: Arrival times of 15 and 19 UTC would be more appropriate. To my opinion (when looking at the air mass travel heights) there was always the possibility for mixing of desert dust with marine particles and anthropogenic haze, originating from Africa, Spain, Italy and accumulating over the Mediterranean Sea. Following reviewer's suggestion, some critical statements have been added to improve the message of the paper (see 1st paragraph of section 2.6). Additionally, in Figure 2, the arrival time at 1500 has been added instead of 1300 UTC (see 3rd paragraph of section 3).

C16274

Figure 3: I see the boundary layer developing in one deep aerosol layer reaching to 3.5-4 km height! That's it. Sure pronounced layers and some layering can be observed, too. But smooth, almost absolutely well mixed layers (indicating considerable aging under undisturbed conditions, no further aerosol sources) can never be observed over Greece (I speculate). Following reviewer's suggestion we have rephrased the 4th paragraph of section 3, referring to Fig. 3.

p.25488: What is the typical value for the particle mass concentration in Athens. Should be mentioned. The optical properties in Figure 5 support my opinion. This is a mixture of dust and haze and ? If I look at the Tesche paper (Tellus 2009) or better Tellus 2011 (SAMUM, Cape Verde), I do not see an agreement with your results. The dust lidar ratio after Tesche seems to be close to 55 sr, but over Athens you observe values higher than 70sr. This is what Tesche (SAMUM, see both part I and II) observes when dust is mixed with smoke over Cape Verde. And the Angstrom values are clearly lower than 0.5 for pure dust after Tesche (and also after Gross. 2011). And your values are around 1 (mixture of haze, AE about 2, and dust, AE about 0) and this it, what I expect for lofted layers is this area. So, the lidar results are trustworthy, the interpretation could be better. Following reviewer's suggestion, we provided a typical value for the particle mass concentration in 5th paragraph of section 3. In the 7th paragraph of section 3 we have extensively commented on AE values greater than 1 and provided the relevant citations.

p. 25490: How do you know these fractions? 15%, 65%, 31-79%? I expected there is always a large contribution of Athen haze. What is the typical haze AOT in Athens? Please mention! The fractions of 15%, 65%, 31-79%, are provided by filter chemical analysis for in situ sampling, as described by Remoundaki et al., 2011. Following reviewer's suggestion, typical haze AOT in Athens is now provided (9th paragraph of section 3).

p. 25492: Obviously the discussion comes to the right conclusion: polluted or mixed dust was observed with lidar! Yes, the reviewer is right! We have corroborated our

C16275

discussion (see 7th paragraph of section 3).

p. 25493: I do not believe in any atmospheric modelling for such a crucial area. Accordance or agreement only means that the model can obviously (re)produce realistic (measured) scenarios. Yes, the reviewer is right! We have added some text in the 17th paragraph of section 3.

p. 25495: The conclusions must be re-phrased. If the Angstrom is higher than 0.5, then the aerosol cannot be pure dust. Pure dust produces 0. to 0.5. Following reviewer's suggestion, the conclusions have been rephrased (section 4); emphasis is given in presenting the numerical results from this paper.

Figure 5: The color plot shows backscatter above 300m. But the optical properties are presented above 1500m. Is there no chance to get some backscatter coefficients in the boundary layer and the entrainment zone so that the potential entrainment of dust into the boundary layer could be studied, or quantified. Figure 5 clearly shows: This is mixed dust, opposed to the pure dust cases found during SAMUM. There should be some error bars at the extinction, backscatter, lidar ratio, and Angstrom values. Figure 6: I do not see (find) the DREAM values. Figure 7a is excellent. But I would plot the AERONET 1330UTC size distribution (at the moment in Fig.7b) in Figure 7a, too, and would then skip 7b. Figures 5, 6 and 7 have been redrawn following reviewer's suggestions. Error bars have been added in Fig, 5. Fig. 6 provides now also the DREAM values. Figs. 7a and 7b have been unified.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/11/C16272/2012/acpd-11-C16272-2012-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 25473, 2011.

C16276