Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, C3272–C3276, 2011
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/11/C3272/2011/

Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Modelling atmospheric OH-reactivity in a boreal forest ecosystem" *by* D. Mogensen et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 12 May 2011

This work uses a 1D vertical transport model combined with a MEGAN emissions module to calculate the OH reactivity at a boreal forest site in Finland. The calculated OH reactivities are then compared to observations made over a period of 16 days during August 2008. The study highlights the impact of local meteorology on observed OH reactivity. The 50-70% underestimate of the observed OH reactivity is consistent with previous studies of OH reactivity, and with the box model comparison for the same data set reported in Sinha et al. (2010). I recommend that this work should be published subject to the following major changes being made.

Major issues

In general the paper should show more model validation through comparison with the available observations at the site. Other than for monoterpenes, model-measurement

failures are only discussed qualitatively making interpretation less than solid. The Authors references Boy et al. (2011) for model to measurement comparisons of VOC concentrations, however this reference also uses only monoterpene observations.

The model description is also incomplete. PTR-MS observations are used as an 'input' but the nature of this input is not described. Are they used as an initial condition or are model concentrations constrained to the observations?

The author needs to discuss the contribution of model generated secondary products to the calculated OH reactivity. It is not obvious from Figure 3 how much of the OH reactivity is coming from primary emitted species and how much from their secondary oxidation products. Are these species significant for OH loss or would the same outcome be obtained using only observations of the inorganic and key organic species, without the need for a large explicit chemistry scheme? Some detail on the relative composition of the "other organics" fraction in Figure 3 would assist in this.

The under prediction of reactivity discussed by the authors is hard to evaluate as the concentrations of modelled primary and secondary species are not described in sufficient detail.

The author mentions that the emissions used do not accurately represent observed isoprene concentrations. However, no indication of the scale of this discrepancy is provided. Although the authors believe isoprene is not a dominant component of the reactivity in this environment, they go on to admit that their model underestimates the isoprene concentration but don't quantify this. A significant failure in the model's simulation of isoprene could address some of the missing reactivity but this is not discussed in detail. How much higher would isoprene emissions have to be to match the isoprene observations? How much higher would the isoprene have to be to match the OH reactivity observations?

There is a significant body of work addressing uncertainties in isoprene oxidation chemistry in low NOx environments((e.g. Lelieveld et al. (2008), Hofzumahaus et al. (2009), Paulot et al., (2009); Whalley et al., (2011); Stone et al., (2011)). The authors do not discuss these results nor the impact on their calculations. This should be addressed. A modelled under estimate in OH would suggest an even larger missing source of isoprene than is currently considered in the model.

Insufficient detail is given about the chemistry scheme used within the model. Specifically: âĂć MCM version number would help when referencing the scheme used. âĂć Changes to the MCM scheme used should be referenced. âĂć The author lists 10 monoterpenes that contribute to the calculated OH reactivity within the model. How does the chemistry scheme treat these species as, other than α- and β-pinene (+limonene in V3.2), the MCM does not contain explicit monoterpene degradation schemes. âĂć How does the model treat the deposition of species?

Is a factor of 2 uncertainty realistic for the rates of OH reaction with all the species chosen to be included in this sensitivity study? The quoted uncertainty on many of the reactions quoted is significantly less than this. The uncertainties that exist in the chemistry are generally not with the oxidation step by OH but in the subsequent degradation chemistry. This section of the paper should either be re-written with a more realistic definition of the uncertainties on these parameters or removed from the paper.

Overall this paper offers an advance in our ability to understand OH reactivity in forested environments. However, as it stands the paper does not provide sufficient details or explanation to allow the reader to interpret the results provided. More work is needed to provide additional information, comparisons and evaluation of the data.

Specific comments

Pg 9135 line 1-3: The statement “Measuring total OH-reactivity using LIF is difficult since it requires the rapid measurement of OH at very low concentrations and requires complicated corrections due to atmospheric NO to be taken into account.” implies that the CRM instrument used does not suffer the same NO interference. This is not true as Sinha et al. (2008) show that the OH reactivity measured by the CRM instrument is indeed sensitive to the NO + HO2 interference. The low NOx conditions at SMEAR II mean that this interference should not be significant in either CRM or LIF instruments at this site (Sinha et al., 2010). The author should re-phase to avoid ambiguity.

Pg 9141 line 1 to 3 (and Table 1): It would be useful for comparison if the author attempted to quantify the observational and modelled variability. Stating if the average quoted is mean or median and quoting a standard deviation over the averaging period would help with this.

Pg 9144 line 15 and in other locations in the paper: Model calculations are exact and diagnosable. Thus the use of words such as “probably” is inappropriate as the model can be diagnosed to reveal why it has calculated such values. The model may be wrong but we should be able to understand why it has done what it has done.

Fig 4: Light blue trace is difficult to see.

Fig 6, 7, 9: Units on OH reactivity legend not labelled.

References

Boy et al., SOSA – a new model to simulate the concentrations of organic vapours and sulphuric acid inside the ABL – Part 1: Model description and initial evaluation. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 43-51, 2011.

Hofzumahaus et al., Amplified trace gas removal in the troposphere. Science, 324, 1702-1704, 2009.

Lelieveld et al., Atmospheric oxidation capacity sustained by a tropical forest. Nature, 452, 737-740, 2008.

Paulot et al., Unexpected epoxide formation in the gas-phase photooxidation of isoprene. Science, 325, 730-733, 2009.

Sinha et al., The comparative reactivity method – A new tool to measure total OH reactivity in ambient air. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 2213-2227, 2008.

Sinha et al., OH reactivity measurements within a boreal forest: Evidence for unknown reactive emissions. Environ. Sci. Technol., 44, 6614-6620, 2010.

Stone et al., Isoprene oxidation mechanisms: measurements and modelling of OH and HO2 over a South-East Asian tropical rainforest during the OP3 field campaign. Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 10343-10401, 2011.

Whalley et al., Quantifying the magnitude of a missing hydroxyl radical source in a tropical rainforest. Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 5785-5809, 2011.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 9133, 2011.