

Interactive comment on “A study of uncertainties in the sulfate distribution and its radiative forcing associated with sulfur chemistry in a global aerosol model” by D. Goto et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 7 July 2011

Twenty years ago Langner&Rodhe published the first global sulfur cycle model study. Although great efforts have been made since then to develop schemes of various degrees of complexity, there are still aspects that are not well understood. This includes, for instance, too slow oxidation of DMS and of SO₂ over higher latitudes in winter (e.g. Koch et al., JGR, 1999). Thus, the study of Goto et al, which investigates the effect of sulfur chemistry and of removal processes on the aerosol radiative forcing, deserves certainly publication in ACP. My only point of critics is that often just the differences between sensitivity simulations are noticed but not really explained. Based on the sensitivity simulations performed it should be possible to elaborate clearer why (if so) the new scheme behaves better than the old one. I miss also a discussion about the impact

C6054

of transport on aerosol distribution. In particular, aerosol concentrations -discussed in this study- in Polar Regions and in high altitudes might be significantly influenced by large-scale and small-scale transport (e.g. Rasch et al., JGR, 2001).

Specific comments: Page 12273 In 18-20: A SO₂ turn-over time of 10 days is well above most estimates which range between 1 – 3 days (e.g. COSAM model intercomparison, Barrie et al., TELLUS B, 2001).

Figure 3 displays the differences between the old (OS) and the new (NS) sulfur scheme. NS includes the release of SO₂ from the aqueous into the gaseous phase if cloud droplets evaporate and the removal of SO₂ by wet scavenging. Can you, please, quantify the importance of these two processes for the SO₂ and SO₄ budgets.

Chapter 4.5: To evaluate the dry deposition of SO₂, not only sulfate but additionally SO₂ concentrations should be compared to observations.

Page 12287 In 26: "In conclusion, the results in NS are much better than those in OS. " This statement is not supported by the results displayed in Figure 5, at least not in Europe and North-America.

Table 5: According to the results of the COSAM comparison, wet deposition of SO₂ is of relatively little importance in the regional budget of SO₂, whereas in the current study (OS model version) 22% of the SO₂ emissions are removed by wet deposition. Is this caused by a different treatment of the processes or by a different method to calculate the budgets? Moreover, according to Figure 3 wet deposition of SO₂ in the aqueous phase is taken into account in model version NS but not in the version OS. Surprisingly, wet deposition in OS is much higher than in NS.

Page 12290 In 7-8: "larger sulfate distributions" shouldn't it be "larger sulfate concentrations"?

Page 12290 In 9-11: "We are speculating ... " Please, give some reasons for the speculation or remove this statement.

C6055

Page 12291 In 21-23: "In OS, aqueous-phase reaction fluxes are generally so large..." wouldn't it be correct "In OS, the winter-time aqueous-phase reaction ..." ? Why is the aqueous oxidation rate of SO₂ higher in winter than in summer?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 12269, 2011.

C6056