

Interactive comment on “Dynamics of nitrogen oxides and ozone above and within a mixed hardwood forest in Northern Michigan” by B. Seok et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 23 February 2013

Review of "Dynamics of nitrogen oxides and ozone above and within a mixed hardwood forest in Northern Michigan, by Seok et al.

General comments:

The authors use profile measurements and a single-column model to simulate the diurnal behavior of the vertical distribution (over a 40 m height) of NO_x and O₃ at a forest site in northern Michigan. The months of August and November are simulated and contrasted, as the biology and weather differ significantly between these 2 months. An interesting feature in the observations is a morning peak in NO and also a morning peak in NO_x. It is concluded that the morning peak in NO is due to the photolysis of

C12857

NO₂ advected to the site from urban areas to the south. However, the results are very unclear as to what causes the peak in NO_x. In my view, the paper comes up very short on this important objective. Indeed when the authors address the cause of the NO_x peak toward the end of the paper, this is the claim: "the observed morning NO_x maximum appears to be caused by (1) the photolysis of NO₂ . . . , or (2) . . ." I may be missing something, but I think the authors may not mean this. Photolysis of NO₂ to NO does not cause any change in NO_x. Is this a mis-statement or what the authors really intend? If it is intended, it merits further explanation, as many will interpret as I have done. I find it frustrating to have a lack of clarity on what is such a fundamental point of the paper. Also, the authors fail to address, head on, the fact that the high levels of NO_x, which they attribute to advection from urban areas to the south, have a diurnal peak that consistently falls shortly after sunrise. This is bewildering. It seems that back trajectories are called for, along with a determination of transit times from the urban areas. I find it very puzzling, indeed interesting, that there is such a tight correlation of the timing of the NO_x peak and sunrise. Why is it not much more variable? On some days, does the peak occur at a different that can be explained by differences in transport? Have the authors considered boundary layer development/growth (hence dilution)? In summary, I find the paper lacking in two important respects, important since they relate to a fundamental objective of the paper, and that is to explain the diurnal pattern in NO_x. The two issues: (1) a claim that the NO_x peak is due to photolysis of NO₂ (2) if the NO_x has an urban source, then why is its peak so tightly correlated with sunrise? (any relation to boundary-layer evolution?)

Specific comments:

p 32516, line 18: "on" → "to"

p 32517, line 2: Soil emissions are not too significant, so why list that one first?

p 32519, line 20: "including" → "and" (since NO₂ does not include the other species)

p 32519, line 28, and following: This depends on age. It is a reasonable estimate at

C12858

young age, but is not reasonable, even for anthropogenic source, at old age (since NO_x has been converted to other species).

p 32520, line 9: How is detection limit defined?

p 32554, fig 3 caption: "dotted" → "dashed"

p 32528, line 12: It is said that understory NO [at <=20 m?] is larger than above canopy NO. I do not see this in fig. 4.

p 32532, line 10: What is the "stability effect"?

section 4.3: I can see why there is a tendency for the NO peak to be tied to sunrise, but why the NO_x peak? If the NO_x peak is due to transport from polluted regions, is this just a coincidence then? And related to the transit time from the urban areas. I would not expect such close correlation with sunrise. This is puzzling.

p 32536, line 9: add 's' to 'mean'

p 32541, last 3 lines: "the observed morning NO_x maximum appears to be caused by (1) the photolysis of NO₂ . . ." This must not be what the authors really mean. Photolysis of NO₂ does not alter NO_x. It converts one form of NO_x to another form of NO_x.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 32515, 2012.