

Interactive comment on “Improved estimate of global dust radiative forcing using a coupled chemical transport-radiative transfer model” by L. Zhang et al.

L. Zhang et al.

li.zhang@colorado.edu

Received and published: 18 May 2013

We would like to thank this Reviewer for the thoughtful and insightful comments. Below are our responses to all the comments.

Reviewer #1 (Comments): General Comments This study addresses the uncertainty in model-predicted estimates of dust radiative forcing due to uncertainties in the vertical distribution of Saharan and Asian mineral dust. Dust transport, direct radiative forcing, and heating rates are computed for the period April 2006 with the global chemistry-transport model GEOS-Chem. In a sensitivity study, the changes in irradiances due to

C2495

the presence of dust particles are calculated once with the modeled vertical structure of dust and once with a light extinction profile, which is derived from the dust optical depth using an exponential weighting function. The latter is an approach that is widely found in models using aerosol climatologies to include the average effect of aerosol particles on radiation. The interesting but predictable results of this study show what climate researchers have been aware for long that the radiative forcing of dust is highly sensitive to its vertical profile, and that the climatological and the actual (modeled) dust distribution can differ dramatically. Most of the current general circulation models with an online computation of radiative effects of mineral dust and other aerosol types use the modeled horizontal AND vertical aerosol distribution. In this regard, the title of the study is somehow misleading, as there is no general improvement in the estimate of the global direct radiative forcing of mineral dust. Also, the duration of the study period is too short to satisfy that demand.

Response: This point is well-taken. We have made revision to the title as “Dust Vertical Profile Impact on Global Radiative Forcing Estimation Using a Coupled Chemical Transport-Radiative Transfer Model”.

In addition, at least some comparisons to observations, e.g., from the European and Asian lidar networks, and from the CALIPSO satellite, should be presented, in order to evaluate the modeled dust distribution.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for the excellent suggestions. We have added a description of the improved dust emission constrained by MISR AOD. We have also included evaluation of the simulated surface PM_{2.5} dust concentration compared to IMPROVE measurements, the simulated dust column AOD compared to MISR AOD, as well as the simulated vertical profile of dust extinction compared to CALIPSO measurements. See Section 2.2 Constraining dust emission using observed AOD.

There is a general issue with the usage of the term “Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD)”, which is commonly defined as the vertically integrated extinction coefficient over a ver-

C2496

tical column of unit cross section. Ignoring the fact that the AOD is a column integral, the authors speak of the vertical distribution or structure of the dust AOD. Here, “vertically resolved AOD per grid level” or “vertical profile of extinction (coefficient)” should be used instead.

Response: This point is well-taken and a correction has been made accordingly.

Specific comments: Introduction, Page 2419, Line 3-4: Sections 5 and 6 are missing in the outline of the paper structure.

Response: Thank you. Corrected as “A description of the models and the validation of dust simulation are presented in Section 2. Section 3 compares the dust vertically resolved AOD by using different vertical profiles. The impacts of different dust vertical profiles on the radiative forcing and heating rate are discussed in Section 4 and Section 5. Summary and discussion are given in Section 6.”

Section 3, Page 2423/2424: The meteorological mechanisms, which cause dust emission, transport, and the formation of characteristic dust layers in the specific regions are not described thoroughly enough. A detailed description should include fundamental structures and terminology (e.g., the Saharan Air Layer for Africa).

Response: Following the Reviewer’s suggestion, a more detailed description has been added. See Page 12: L17 ~ Page 15: L12.

Section 6: The Summary and Conclusion section ends abruptly and lacks of some outlook and implications that the results have.

Response: In response to this comment, we have rewritten the text and added a number of sentences in the Section 6 Summary and Discussion. See Page 26-28.

Figures, In all line plots and cross sections, the axis and/or color bar labels are missing.

Response: Corrected accordingly, thank you.

C2497

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/13/C2495/2013/acpd-13-C2495-2013-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 2415, 2013.

C2498