**Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions**

Interactive comment on "Global mapping of vertical injection profiles of wild-fire emission" *by* M. Sofiev et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 4 October 2012

General Comments

This paper presents a global parameterization of injection heights for fire emissions with a 1x1 horizontal and 500 m vertical resolutions and monthly spatial resolution. The Authors compare results of their parameterization with derived-plume heights from CALIOP and recommended injection heights from the AEROCOM framework.

The problem of parameterizing injection height of smoke emissions from wildfire in large-scale atmospheric models is a challenging task and the modeling community is actually in need for a robust parameterization that allows for modeling reliably the vertical distribution of fire emissions.

Although the topics of this work are of relevant interest for the scientific community, I

regret to say that, in my opinion, the manuscript should be declined. Major revisions are otherwise necessary before it can be re-considered for review.

I strongly recommend the Authors to thoroughly revise their manuscript by drastically improving the quality of writing style and the organization of the manuscript. The goal is to provide a clear description of the methods and assumptions made to develop their parameterization. This will hopefully make the narrative flow, so that the reader can focus on the science of this work rather than guessing what points the Authors are trying to make. Another major concern is the literature review, which seems to be patchy and incomplete.

Aside from clarity and organization, the major limitation of this paper is that it does not seem to introduce any sufficiently innovative science results. The parameterization of fire injection heights is indeed new. However, ACP may not be the best journal to publish it. I would strongly recommend to re-submit this work to a more applied journal, such as Geoscientific Model Development.

Below, I have added some specific comments, which I hope may help the Authors go through the resubmission process. Please, note that I have not made any specific comments on the English grammar and typos since this would make the review unnecessarily long.

Specific comments

Section 1.

Page 19211 Line 2. [. . .], but strong fires occurring under 'unstable' atmospheric conditions can send [. . .].

Page 19211 Line 22. Lavoue et al [2000]'s fire injection parameterization is based simply on fire intensities; their method does not take into account atmospheric stability conditions. In addition, the Authors are missing many references here. For example, the works of Rio et al., [2010], Rafusse et al., [2012], Stein et al., [2009] should be

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

cited and adequately compared to the presented methodology.

Page 19212 Line 3. Val Martin et al. [2010] also evaluated the relationship between MISR plume height and MODIS FRP and atmospheric stability conditions. In addition, Tosca et al., [2011] evaluated an extensive MISR plume height climatology over Indonesia. This work should be cited as well.

Section 2.1

Although the calculation of the top-height of fire emission plumes, which is key in this paper, was described in Sofiev et al., [2012], it would help the reader understand the next steps if some details were given in section 2.1. For example, the semi-empirical equation was constrained using MISR plume heights, which they are not mentioned until section 3.1. Also, the determination of the semi-empirical formula has some uncertainties, which are not addressed at all.

I understand that developing a parameterization of fire emission injection heights is a difficult task, many assumptions need to be made and many uncertainties exist. For example, the semi-empirical equation does not take into account entrainment processes that the plume can undergo. In addition, MODIS FRP has many uncertainties (e.g. obscuration for clouds and dense smoke) and the meteorological fields used may not provide the most accurate state of the atmosphere at the location of the fire. The reader needs to be aware of all these caveats.

I wonder why the Authors use an equation derived using MISR plume heights without any screening, that is, using 'good', 'fair' and 'poor' quality plumes and later in section 3.1 the Authors only use 'good' quality plumes to evaluate further the approach on a global scale. I am familiar with the work presented in Sofiev et al., [2012] and the Authors explicitly said there that using the MISR 'good' quality plumes to derive the semi-empirical equation would results in statistically unreliable coefficients for the equation.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Equation (2) is not an equation per-se; It shows the coefficients of Equation (1). Also, in Sofiev et al., [2012], $N2o = 2.5 \times 10^{-4}$ s-2 and not 2.5×10^{-3} s-2.

Section 2.2

This section is not very clear. Why is this section divided into problem statement and problem solution? More simply, it could be presented as whole and the text could describe the development of the vertical profile of the fire emissions. Overall, I found this section poorly explained and I had a hard time to understand the procedure and methods used to come up with the vertical profile of fire emissions.

Page 19213 Line 18. Sukhinin et al. [2005], Kaufman et al. [1998], and Sofiev et al., [2009] are not the only studies that have related fire radiative energy with emission rate. See Wooster et al., [2005], Freeborn et al., [2008], Kaiser et al., [2012], for example.

Equation (4). Does the approach square to two the emission rate Pf(t)?

The explanation of the epsilon determination is unclear. Perhaps the Authors could include a simple graph to show the vertical distribution of the emissions based on the Briggs approach.

Page 19214 Line 24. Is PM Particle matter? If so, what are the particle sizes considered, PM2.5, PM10, total PM? Please, also define PM.

The Authors propose to use the emission factors proposed by Andrea and Merlet [2001] to scale the PM from the IS4FIRES. Akagi et al., [2011] provide a more comprehensive, updated collection of emission factors for fire species.

The Authors indicate that profiles are computed for total emissions. Are those emissions PM or the sum of all the species emitted in the fire? What are the units?

Section 2.3.1

I suggest including a description of the MODIS FRP data: product level, spatial and temporal resolution, etc.

In addition to MODIS, SEVIRI and VIRS, another satellite product that provides fire information is GOES WF-ABBA.

Section 2.3.2

The Authors should provide more information on the ECMWF meteorological fields: horizontal, vertical, spatial resolution, etc.

A dry-parcel method is used to estimate PBL heights, which are evaluated with other approaches. Please explain what those approaches are. How well the dry-parcel method estimates the PBL height?

Section 2.3.3

The MISR plume height climatology does not provide continuous measurements for all the regions specified by the Authors from 2005-2008. For example, plumes in Siberia are provided only for August 2002, May 2003, July 2006 and April-July 2008, plumes in Africa for December, 2005 and January, 2006, etc, etc. The Authors should provide accurate information.

What is the spatial resolution of CALIOP aerosol product?

Section 3.1

The Authors state that the new MISR data were not available for the Sofiev et al., [2012] study. I am not sure that is correct. The MISR plume height dataset for North America, Africa and Siberia is publicity available since 2009. The Authors should reword this statement.

The Authors could reference the works of Nelson et al. [2008] and Val Martin et al., [2010] so the reader can be directed to more complete information on the MISR plume height uncertainties.

The MISR plume height dataset provides with different definitions of plume height (e.g., best estimated median, maximum height, etc). What is the definition used here?

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

The semi-empirical formula misses about 30% of the cases for temperate and boreal forest and tropical savannah in Africa, so the approach is not perfect. The Authors state that it can be applied to the whole world. I understand that the equation is as good as it gets. However, the Authors should smooth out the text and indicate that uncertainties exist.

Section 7 seems to be missing.

Section 3.2

Lines 13-14. The statement is not new, so a reference should be provided.

Line 15-16. What do the Authors mean with 'their product'? Those lines are not clear.

What is a LEO satellite?

Lines 27-28. Can a variation be as large as another? What variation do the Authors refer to? Do they mean that the diurnal variability of active fires is similar in VIRS and SEVIRI? This sentence is not clear and should be reworded.

The Authors state that "Estimating of diurnal cycles directly from MODIS data is not feasible" and "Analysis of FRP could not be performed due to early saturation of VIRS infrared channels". Vermote et al., [2009] show the diurnal cycle of FRP using MODIS and VIRS as well as SEVIRI in different biomes (i.e, boreal Russia, Brazil and northern Africa, respectively).

In addition, I wonder if the diurnal cycle of active fires is the same in equatorial regions as in extratropical regions. Fires over different regions and vegetation types have complete different regimes. Mu et al., [2011] show, using GOES WF-ABBA active fire counts, that the diurnal cycle of grassland fires have a different cycle than forest and shrublands in boreal and temperate America.

The Authors use SEVIRI to determine the diurnal cycle of fires for grassland, forest and mixed. How did the Authors classify grassland, forest and mixed fires? Also, as far

as I know, the SEVIRI domain only includes Africa and Europe. However, the Authors apply the diurnal cycle obtained over that domain to the globe. How accurate is that?

The Authors show the Fourier coefficients for the diurnal cycle of active fires in Table 1. However, nothing of this analysis is explained in the text. That is very confusing. Also, the Authors end up applying the mean diurnal cycle regardless of the vegetation type. Table 1 could provide at least the mean coefficients used in the analysis.

Also, I am a bit confused on why the Authors use the total FRP diurnal cycle for the emission fluxes and FRP per-pixel diurnal cycle for the injection heights. Both cycles do not significantly differ from each other.

Section 3.3

This section is very confusing. It describes a smoothing procedure, which is not applied to the results presented in the paper.

What numerical dataset the Author s refer?

Section 4

I am not convinced entirely by the results. For example, the parameterization returns one of the highest injection heights over the Middle East and south of the Caspian Sea. In my understanding, those regions are classified as semi-desert shrub and prairies. Injection heights from fires for those biomes are not expected to be high, in particular over semi-desert vegetation.

In addition, it is not expected that extremely high fires over Siberia and the boreal regions be represented in their map as the Authors stated. Extreme high fires over the boreal region are very episodic. The semi-empirical equation that estimates injection heights was constrained by MISR plume heights. The MISR overpass time is around 11:00-13:00 over North America and fires over that region are not at their maximum intensity [Kahn et al., 2008; Val Martin et al., 2010]. Also, the MISR plume dataset screened out pyrocumulus clouds associated with intense fires, so the 'infamous ex-

tremely high' plumes are not taken into account in this approach.

In Figure 4, the Authors show February and August to demonstrate the seasonality of the injection heights. It would be more accurate if they show complete seasons, for example, the average injection heights for June, July and August for summer and December, January and February for winter.

In addition to Figure 5, the Authors could add another figure showing the vertical injection height distribution of fire emissions obtained for single grids at different vegetation types (e.g, boreal forest, Australian forest, African savannah, etc). These profiles will help see the difference obtained for the injection height profiles in different parts of the world.

Page 19221 Lines 1-2. "[. . .] more than 50% of the fire emission is confined within the lowest 1–2 km, i.e. within the ABL, consistent with previous studies [e.g., Labonne et al. 2007; Kahn et al, 2008; Sofiev et al 2009; Val Martin et al, 2010].

Section 5.1

Page 19221 Line 11-18. It is not clear from the text and the figures how the Authors evaluated the plume-top formulations.

The last paragraph in this section mentions the disconnection between the plume formation time and the MODIS FRP time as a source of uncertainty. How did the Authors determine the 15-30 min disconnection? It is also not clear how they come up with the 20-30% difference in FRP using the parameters in Table 1.

I would suggest including the possible effect of uncertainties in MODIS FRP and the ECMWF meteorological fields on the outcomes of the presented method.

Section 5.2

The Authors use years 2001 and 2008 to determine the injection height profiles and mention that they provide enough coverage and are representative of the interan-

nual variability of the fires. Fires in Africa, South America and Indonesia are mainly from agricultural activities or from deforestation and have similar inter-annual variability. However, fires over forest regions such as Siberia or northern America have a strong inter-annual variability. In fact, year 2001 was a low fire year over Alaska, Canada and Siberia, whereas year 2008 was a low fire year for Alaska and Canada, but exceptionally high fire for spring in Siberia.

As the Authors point out in Line 3 page 19223, year 2001 only contains MODIS data from Terra whereas analysis in year 2008 contains MODIS Terra and Aqua. The reviewer wonders why year 2001 was picked instead of, for example, year 2003, in which MODIS Aqua was fully operational during the whole year.

Would the same results be obtained if several years were used in the analysis (e.g. from 2003 to 2008) and the average of those profiles were used to provide a global injection height map instead? I believe the global dataset would result more robust. In fact, a variability (or standard deviation) could be computed for each grid cell and an uncertainty in the results can be reported.

What type of strong fires burned in the Middle East in 2008?

Section 5.4

Page 19225 Lines 5-10. Please cite previous work that investigated the export of biomass burning out of the coast of Africa. For example, work from the TRACE-A or AMMA campaigns (Mauzerall et al 1996; Fiedler et al 2011).

The Authors state that CALIOP measurement at night did not differ from daytime and that is 'evidently wrong'. As the Authors well explain later, CALIOP may measure aged smoke at night remaining from the previous day at night. The reviewer suggests "smoothing" this point.

Section 5.5

The Authors state that tundra regions over northern Eurasia have low fuel loads. The

reviewer asks to provide a reference for this statement. Tundra regions have deep layers of organic matter that can potentially burn, and in turn fuel loads over those regions are very large [Kasischke et al., 2005]. Perhaps the Authors meant to say fuel consumption instead of fuel loads or that usually are more surface fires than crown fires.

Page Line 7-9. The Authors state that fires over the North America boreal region are predominantly of low intensity and injection height. This seems to contradict previous work. For example, Val Martin et al. [2010] showed that plume heights over forest and shrubland in the boreal region were the highest and the most intense out of all the biomes studied over North America with the MISR plume height dataset. In addition, Ichoku et al. [2008] using MODIS FRP show that fires over Alaska, Canada and Quebec regions are the most intense in the world on a regional scale.

As a final remark, I do not fully understand why the Authors compare their injection heights and vertical distribution of fire emissions with CALIOP and AEROCOM. The most comprehensive dataset of plume heights that exist up-to-date is the MISR plume height climatology developed at NASA JPL. The Authors use that dataset to develop a parameterization, but there is nothing available to validate this parameterization on a global scale. The spatial coverage of CALIOP is limited and it typically measures smoke far away from the source, so it is difficult to used CALIOP data to look at injection heights from young plumes, which it is what the Authors' product is meant to provide. Likewise, the AEROCOM global injection height distribution is subjective and was developed to recommend injection heights in atmospheric chemistry model studies, whose accuracy has never been verified. Therefore the validation of the methodology presented here seems to be questionable.

Figures

Figure 1 caption is not correct for the temporal description of MISR plumes. North America plumes are for 2002, 2004-2007; Siberia and Africa plumes are for only a

few months in several years (see text above); Borneo plumes are also for agriculture peatland fires in addition to tropical forest fires, from 2001 to 2009, unless the quality screening removed several years of data.

References

Akagi, S. K., Yokelson, R. J., Wiedinmyer, C., Alvarado, M. J., Reid, J. S., Karl, T., Crounse, J. D., and Wennberg, P. O.: Emission factors for open and domestic biomass burning for use in atmospheric models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 4039-4072, doi:10.5194/acp-11-4039-2011, 2011.

Fiedler, V., Arnold, F., Ludmann, S., Minikin, A., Hamburger, T., Pirjola, L., Dörnbrack, A., and Schlager, H.: African biomass burning plumes over the Atlantic: aircraft based measurements and implications for H2SO4 and HNO3 mediated smoke particle activation, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 3211-3225, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3211-2011, 2011

Ichoku, C., Giglio, L., Wooster, M. J., and Remner, L.: Global characterization of biomass-burning patterns using satellite measurements of fire radiative energy, Remote Sens. Environ., 112, 2950–2962, 2008.

Kasischke, E. S., E. J. Hyer, P. C. Novelli, L. P. Bruhwiler, N. H. F. French, A. I. Sukhinin, J. H. Hewson, and B. J. Stocks (2005), Influences of boreal fire emissions on Northern Hemisphere atmospheric carbon and carbon monoxide, Global Biogeochem.Cycles, 19, GB1012, doi:10.1029/2004GB002300.

Nelson, D., Lawshe, C., Mazzoni, D., Diner, D., and Kahn, R.:MISR Plume Height Climatology Project: Quality Statement and Error and Bias Analysis, Jet Propulsion Lab, NASA. Published on the web, http://www-misr2.jpl.nasa.gov/EPA-Plumes/suggestions4UsingData.cfm, 2008.

Mauzerall, D. L., J. A. Logan, D. J. Jacob, B. E. Anderson, D. R. Blake, J. D. Bradshaw, B. Heikes, G. W. Sachse, H. Singh, and B. Talbot (1998), Photochemistry in biomass burning plumes and implications for tropospheric ozone over the tropical South Atlantic,

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

J. Geophys. Res., 103(D7), 8401–8423, doi:10.1029/97JD02612.

Mu, M., et al. (2011), Daily and 3âĂŘhourly variability in global fire emissions and consequences for atmospheric model predictions of carbon monoxide, J. Geophys. Res., 116, D24303, doi:10.1029/2011JD016245.

Raffuse, S. M., K. J. Craig, N. K. Larkin, T. T. Strand, D. C. Sullivan, N. J. M. Wheeler,and R. Solomon (2012), An evaluation of modeled plume injection height with satellite-derived observed plume height, Atmosphere, 3 (1), 103-123, doi:10.3390/atmos3010103.

Rio, C., F. Hourdin, and A. Chedin (2010), Numerical simulation of tropospheric injection of biomass burning products by pyro-thermal plumes, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 10 (8), doi:10.5194/acp-10-3463-2010.

Stein, A. F., G. D. Rolph, R. R. Draxler, B. Stunder, and M.Ruminsk (2009), Verification of the NOAA smoke forecasting system: Model sensitivity to the injection height, Wea. Forecasting, 24, 379-394, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2008WAF2222166.1.

Tosca, M., J. Randerson, C. Zender, D. Nelson, D. Diner, and J. Logan (2011), Dynamics of fire plumes and smoke clouds associated with peat and deforestation fires in Indonesia, Journal of Geophysical Research, 116, D08207, doi:10.1029/2010JD015148.

Val Martin, M., J. A. Logan, R. A. Kahn, F.-Y. Leung, D. L. Nelson, and D. J. Diner (2010), Smoke injection heights from fires in North America: analysis of 5 years of satellite observations, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 10 (4), 1491-1510, doi:10.5194/acp-10-1491-2010.

Vermote, E., E. Ellicott, O. Dubovik, T. Lapyonok, M. Chin, L. Giglio, and G. J. Roberts (2009), An approach to estimate global biomass burning emissions of organic and black carbon from MODIS fire radiative power, J. Geophys. Res., 114, D18205,doi:10.1029/2008JD011188.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 19209, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper