

1 We thank the reviewers for their helpful comments and recommendations, which could
2 help us improve the paper. In the following, we address the issues raised by the reviewers
3 in detail except for simple typographical or technical corrections, which we simply applied.

4 We repeat and enumerate the comments of the reviewers for convenience in bold face.
5 Excerpts from the revised paper are shown as indented blocks; if longer unchanged sections
6 are contained in the excerpts, changes are marked in italics.

7 1 Reviewer Comments 1

- 8 1. **A difficulty in the study is the heterogeneity of the data used
9 in combination for the analysis (ECMWF, NCEP and aircraft
10 measurement), even though the main results do not depend on
11 the perfect match between these data. But the conclusion that
12 filaments do not follow isentropes could be at least partly due
13 to such a mismatch (see p.5048 1.25-28 and p.5060 1.4-5). In
14 Fig. 3, the isentropes look as expected with respect to the PV
15 contours: The vertical spacing between isentropes is small within
16 the positive PV anomaly (in the northern part of the graphs) as
17 vertical gradient of the potential temperature is enhanced; the
18 vertical spacing then increases passed 2PVU towards the tropical
19 troposphere; in the region of the jet, isentropes tend to be aligned
20 with the PV gradients. But in Fig. 5, they look less natural with
21 respect to the PV contours and they don't have the small scales
22 that would be expected in such a region. The interpolation could
23 well be responsible for errors on the location and tilt of isentropes
24 in this region. Since this region is very dynamical and has lots
25 of small scales, interpolation between two 6hourly data can be
26 inaccurate. I recommend to add a sentence or two on this aspect
27 in the article on p. 5048 1.25-28, and to recall it in the conclusion
28 on p. 5060 1.4-5.**

29 The employed interpolation is certainly prone to artefacts and we are actively working
30 on a better trajectory based one. We thus added the sentences:

31 This filament seems to be not isentropic but covers instead a range of potential tem-
32 perature from 365 K for the highest altitude with a VMR of 300 pptv down to 335 K.
33 Several factors may contribute to this discrepancy. First, both the intrusion of PAN
34 into the stratosphere as also the further development of the filamentary structure along
35 the baroclinic jet-stream may have been non-adiabatic. In addition, the ECMWF tem-
36 perature model data may be mis-aligned in time and space with the actual physical
37 structure; further artefacts might be introduced by the linear interpolation in time of
38 the available model data. Last, the derived trace gas VMRs represent a complicated
39 weighted mean along the line-of-sight of the instrument, being slightly different for each
40 derived quantity, causing further misalignment with the ECMWF temperature data
41 sampled at tangent point locations.

1 In addition the conclusion was modified to

2 This may indicate that the processes leading up to the imaged situation involve non-
3 adiabatic processes such as uplift by a warm conveyor belt or gravity waves instigated by
4 the baroclinic jet stream. Partly, this may also be an artefact of an imperfect alignment
5 between ECMWF temperature data and the position of retrieved trace gas parcels.

- 6 **2. I was sad not to see the water vapour in 2d too! I understand**
7 **that it is argued in the manuscript that this chemical does not**
8 **bring enough to the main results and therefore is not included.**
9 **But it's such a great tracer and it is so important radiatively. I**
10 **would welcome it if you decided to include it.**

11 It is indeed sad, but the employed frequency range lacks the required precision for the
12 reliable retrieval of stratospheric water vapour concentrations. However, in future
13 work based on data acquired by the newly developed GLORIA sounder, we plan
14 to use water vapour as tropospheric tracer as more suitable frequencies are readily
15 available.

- 16 **3. In the explanation on the instrument and Fig 1 in Section 2, could**
17 **you add a sentence or two on the resolution of the measurements**
18 **in the line-of-sight direction?**

19 The following sentence was added at the specified place:

20 The resolution along the line-of-sight is between ≈ 200 and 300 km, depending on the
21 observed altitude.

- 22 **4. P. 5046 l. 5-8: Could you clarify please?**

23 The sentence was revised to

24 The region of sampling is under double tropopause conditions during the flight period,
25 as indicated in the figure. The primary and secondary tropopause levels shown in the
26 figure are derived using the ECMWF temperature profiles.

- 27 **5. p. 5046, l. 23-24: This description is not accurate and its purpose**
28 **is not clear at this stage. Rephrase please.**

29 The textual passage was changed to:

30 The potential temperature structure of the cross section shows typical characteristics of
31 the subtropical transition. The 330–360 K isentropes show upward/downward inclina-
32 tions above/below the jet core level, marked by the 355 K isentrope, as the flight moving
33 equatorward across the jet. Although these are well known structures, we point it out
34 to connect to the tracer structure shown later.

- 35 **6. p. 5046 end of page: Can you say if there were any clouds in the**
36 **region?**

1 There were few clouds seen during the flight and all parcels, for which we derived
2 trace gas VMRs are cloud free. Clouds form basically the lower boundary for the
3 retrieval before 06:50 UTC and are sometimes below 8 km altitude after 08:45 UTC.

4 We added

5 There were few clouds seen during the flight above 8 km and all parcels, for which trace
6 gas VMRs are derived, are cloud free.

7 to the section describing the synoptic situation.

- 8 **7. p. 5051, discussion on Fig. 9: Did you look at the PV and**
9 **potential temperature values along the trajectories? Could that**
10 **bring some additional information on the dynamics of mixing?**

11 Yes, but we do not see clear indications. Since the PV and potential temperature
12 histories of the parcel are interpolated from the large-scale field, we do not expect
13 the stretching and mixing to be explicitly represented. More discussion along this
14 line is given in Konopka and Pan (2012).

- 15 **8. Section 3.5: You do not mention that HNO₃ is also a stratospheric**
16 **compound. Is the stratospheric source of nitric acid really negli-**
17 **gible for your purpose? I recommend to add a comment on this**
18 **aspect in this section.**

19 We reworked the first two paragraphs to include this point:

20 This section introduces a proxy for the total reactive nitrogen NO_y from retrieved trace
21 gases and uses this to estimate the influence of tropospheric pollution on air masses in
22 the UTLS. *The NO_y proxy proves especially useful when combined with the available*
23 *O₃ measurements. NO_y and O₃ are well correlated in the lower stratosphere. This is*
24 *not a consequence of a direct chemical connection, but because their source regions, sink*
25 *regions, and lifetimes are similar, so that their distribution is jointly determined mostly*
26 *by transport and mixing processes (Murphy et al., 1993). As the correlation is especially*
27 *strong in the lowermost stratosphere, deviations thereof may be used to determine the*
28 *origin of measured air masses.*

29 The total reactive nitrogen plays an important role in the polluted and unpolluted
30 atmosphere. It mainly consists of NO, NO₂, PAN, HNO₃, HO₂NO₂, and alkyl and
31 multifunctional nitrates. According to Singh et al. (2007), PAN, HNO₃, and NO_x
32 (= NO + NO₂) are the major contributors to NO_y in the extratropical UTLS with
33 a combined fractional percentage of about 95% on average. NO₂ reacts with OH and a
34 third-body to HNO₃, which is in turn converted back to NO₂ (and OH) by photolysis.
35 In the altitude range of the UTLS, the conversion to HNO₃ is much faster, so any
36 stable equilibrium between NO₂ and HNO₃ will heavily favour HNO₃ (Austin et al.,
37 1986). As there are no NO_x estimates available from CRISTA-NF measurements, only
38 a proxy for NO_y can be formed by the sum of the available dominant contributors
39 PAN, HNO₃, and ClONO₂. The latter trace gas could be neglected for the current
40 atmospheric situation but would be important for the analysis of polar measurements.
41 In the measurements of Singh et al. (2007), NO_x was the major constituent of NO_y
42 close to the troposphere, so the given NO_y proxy might underestimate the true NO_y

1 by a factor of 2 to 3, depending on the altitude. But in contrast to the measurements
2 of Singh et al. (2007), most of the air measured by CRISTA-NF should be free of recent
3 influx caused by convection, so the NO_x content should be much lower and the HNO_3
4 content much higher due to prolonged ageing. Using the satellite instrument UARS,
5 Morris et al. (1997) found a ratio of just 0.1 between NO_x and NO_y at 550 K (≈ 22 km),
6 implying that the proxy should become more reliable towards the flight level.

7 2 Reviewer Comments 2

8 2.1 Major concerns

9 In my opinion, besides the nice 2-D visualization of the structures,
10 the scientifically most exciting observation is the different chemical
11 composition of the filaments/structures, e.g. the dislocation of the
12 features in O_3 , PAN, and HNO_3 in the eastern cross-section. This
13 should be better carved out. I suggest the following:

- 14 1. For better discern the features for the reader, combine the 3 fig-
15 ures 5-7 in one (5a-c) and locate them on top of another on one
16 page (in which you need the caption for the x-axis only in the
17 lowest graph). Can you somehow lay all three trace gas distri-
18 butions one over the other, e.g. by using contour plots with a
19 different colour for each gas and only 3-4 contour lines per gas
20 (as graph 5d)?

21 The suggested figure placement was not sensible in the physical format of the discus-
22 sion paper, but will be used in the final paper.

23 We played around with a couple of visualisation options (e.g. an RGB model for
24 the three trace gasses) and also contour plots. The visibility of even a reduced set
25 of contour lines per gas is poor, though. In the end, the geo-spatial visualisation of
26 tracer-tracer space as shown in the end seems to give the best overview.

- 27 2. From the tracer-tracer-correlation plots one should learn more.
28 First, flip x- and y-axis. O_3 is usually on the y-axis to visualize
29 the transition into the stratosphere. The colours in the Figs. 11,
30 12, 13 are not well chosen, especially the light and dark purple are
31 badly distinguishable, at least on printed hardcopies. I haven't
32 understood from where exactly the air masses in Fig. 11 come
33 from. Did you just show a data subset with the limits given in the
34 box? With these limits you must get a L-shape tracer relation-
35 ship, independent on the data. Then I haven't understood the
36 sense of this figure. Is the source region of the light purple data
37 points really so small so that the interpretation of the PAN/ O_3
38 slope as (chemically generated) enhancement ratio is valid? May

1 it also be possible that the slope simply reflects spatial gradients
2 in the trace gases? ... which would make the interpretation of
3 the slope senseless.

4 With respect to choice of axis in tracer-tracer plots: we decided to follow Murphy
5 et al. (1993) in plotting the ozone-PAN and ozone-NO_y relationship.

6 With respect to choice of colour scheme: The similarity of purple colours is somewhat
7 intentional. The most important distinction we want to make is between the three
8 groups of colours. The shading change within the group is less significant. We
9 will nevertheless make some changes of the purple to make it easier to identify the
10 differences especially in printed copies.

11 Figure 11 is indeed a subset of data points. We will make this more clear in the text.
12 The intention of the “pink” group is to identify the differences between the tropical
13 air and mid-latitude air in tracer-tracer space. The actual slope is not part of the
14 discussion.

- 15 3. **The most exciting air mass is the green one in Fig.12. O₃ is 200-**
16 **300 ppbv and thus stratospheric, but PAN as tropospheric tracer**
17 **is likewise enhanced and reaches up to 500 pptv. The green air**
18 **masses thus characterize exTL air, right?! I am not an expert in**
19 **PAN chemistry, but how the PAN is formed there. React e.g.**
20 **certain aldehydes or oxygenated VOCs with O₃, so that PAN was**
21 **in-situ formed? Simple mixing of air masses in the exTL do not**
22 **form such strange tracer inter-relationships. Or is O₃ wrong, i.e.**
23 **too high?**

24 Indeed, the green shaded areas mark the ExTL identified by the specified criteria.
25 PAN is formed from many hydrocarbons as secondary pollutant. It is rather quickly
26 formed and may stay at the depicted altitudes and temperatures for up to several
27 weeks before being photolytically destroyed. PAN actually forms ozone when reacting
28 with NO₂, but not to an extent which may explain the ozone anomaly.

29 When interpreting the results, one certainly has to keep in mind, that to some extent,
30 the relationships are also influenced by smoothing introduced by both the measure-
31 ment principle and also the regularisation. Also the precision of the measurements is
32 a notable effect as depicted in error bars in the plots. Thirdly, PAN is certainly more
33 heterogeneously distributed in the troposphere and offers thus a different picture
34 from, e.g. CO, which we sadly cannot retrieve from our measurements.

35 2.2 Minor concerns

- 36 1. **p.5040, l.22. “chemically inhomogeneous UTLS region”. Change**
37 **it (although I assume what you want to say)**

38 We revised it to

1 ... picture of the inhomogeneous distribution of chemical species within the UTLS re-
2 gion.

- 3 2. **p.5048, l.23ff. “This filament ...”. Try graph d (see above) to**
4 **visualize possible dis- placements**

5 A contour plot, especially one that may be printed, sadly does not help here. The
6 textual description details the important points.

- 7 3. **p.5050ff. It is hard to reconstruct what air mass is just meant.**
8 **Thus, define in a list the different air masses with the relevant**
9 **colour and ever use this definition in the text, e.g. - “tropospheric**
10 **(blue)” - “high-stratospheric (red)” ...**

11 The suggestion is followed and the filaments are introduced as

12 Four different air streams are identified:

- 13 • the “high-stratospheric (red)” filament,
- 14 • the “middle-stratospheric (green)” filament,
- 15 • the “low-stratospheric (blue)” filament, and the
- 16 • the “tropospheric (black)” filament.

17 The “high-stratospheric (red)” and “high-stratospheric (green)” filament are selected
18 to represent the filament with HNO_3 enhancement and lie mostly within the lower
19 stratosphere poleward of the jet. The “low-stratospheric (blue)” filament is selected to
20 represent the HNO_3 enhanced air mass below the tropopause and is associated with
21 the stratospheric intrusion. Last, the “tropospheric (black)” filament is selected because
22 this air mass of elevated PAN VMRs may give insight into the tropospheric sources of
23 the PAN content of the more stratospheric filaments.

- 24 4. **p.5053, l.15. This ozone threshold of 175 ppbv is far too high**
25 **for an ozone tropopause threshold value which is (seasonally de-**
26 **pendent, typically between 70 and 130 ppbv). That is, the given**
27 **categorization of air mass types and their names in Table 2 are**
28 **definitely not correct.**

29 The 175 ppbv ozone criterion is high but the empirically sensible choice based on our
30 ozone values from the retrieval. We will add some discussions in the text:

31 The high tropospheric ozone threshold of 175 ppbv is based on the ozone distribution
32 in the sampling region from the retrieval. This high value may be a combination of UT
33 ozone retrieval uncertainty (see Tab 1) and pollution in the sampled air mass.

- 34 5. **p.5053.l20 – p.5054.l3. This review on the sources of PAN is**
35 **something for an introduction and not for the discussion.**

36 The section was streamlined to the part necessary to demonstrate PAN to be a
37 suitable tropospheric tracer:

1 In contrast, the major sources of PAN as a secondary pollutant are biomass burning and
2 anthropogenic pollution in the troposphere (Stephens, 1969). Its lifetime is compara-
3 tively short, ranging from seconds in the lower troposphere to days and months in the
4 uppermost troposphere (e.g. Roberts, 1990). Thus, it can serve as tropospheric tracer.
5 The distribution of PAN VMRs in measured air parcels above the uppermost detected
6 thermal tropopause shows that only few air parcels surpass 80 pptv of PAN. Air parcels
7 with less than 80 pptv are therefore considered to be chemically stratospheric.

- 8 **6. p.5054.14-11. A L-shape relationship especially of O₃ with CO**
9 **and H₂O is only seen in the subtropics at sufficiently high alti-**
10 **tudes, but e.g. never in air masses originating polewards of 40°,**
11 **simply as basically everywhere there is an exTL (characterized**
12 **by a non-L-shape transition from trop to strat air). Rephrase it.**

13 The discussion was reorganised:

14 Trajectory analyses presented in the previous section indicate that the filamentary struc-
15 ture is created by large-scale dynamical processes including Rossby wave breaking. The
16 trajectory calculations, however, are only representing advection by the wind field. The
17 formation of the observed structure involves both advection and mixing (Konopka and
18 Pan, 2012). In this case, small scale processes such as turbulent mixing induced by the
19 shear and strain in the flow, are also expected to contribute to the observed structure,
20 which can be diagnosed using tracer-tracer relationships. Thus, this section explores
21 *the chemical characteristics of the observed trace gas structure using tracer-tracer rela-*
22 *tionships. This analysis aims to project the information gained in chemical tracer-tracer*
23 *space to geo-spatial space. As a result, a highly-resolved two-dimensional geo-spatial pic-*
24 *ture of the UTLS composition near the tropopause break reveals the accumulative effect*
25 *of advection and mixing of stratospheric and tropospheric air.*

26 *Our analyses focus on the tracer-tracer relationship between O₃ and PAN, i.e., using*
27 *O₃ as the stratospheric tracer and PAN as the tropospheric tracer. O₃ is the most*
28 *frequently used stratospheric tracer. (e.g. Hoor et al., 2002; Pan et al., 2004). Using*
29 *the flight data, 175 ppbv is used as a critical value to separate the stratospheric and*
30 *tropospheric air mass. This threshold is higher than the typical 60 to 100 ppbv used in*
31 *previous studies (compare Singh et al., 2007; Pan et al., 2007). This empirical threshold*
32 *is based on the O₃ distribution in the sampling region from the retrieval. This higher*
33 *value may be a combination of UT ozone retrieval uncertainty (see Tab 1) and pollution*
34 *in the sampled airmass.*

35 *As a tropospheric tracer, PAN has some different characteristics from the frequently*
36 *used compounds such as CO and H₂O. As a secondary pollutant are biomass burning*
37 *and anthropogenic pollution in the troposphere (Stephens, 1969). Its lifetime is com-*
38 *paratively short, ranging from seconds in the lower troposphere to days and months in*
39 *the uppermost troposphere (e.g. Roberts, 1990). 80 pptv of PAN were chosen as the*
40 *threshold for stratospheric air, i.e., air parcels with less than 80 pptv are considered to*
41 *be chemically stratospheric.*

42 *As discussed in previous work, the tracer-tracer relationship in the UTLS for a strato-*
43 *spheric and tropospheric tracer pair is approximately an “L” shape (e.g. Hints et al.,*
44 *1998; Hoor et al., 2002; Pan et al., 2007). The generally compact relationship is from*
45 *the significantly different ranges of variability between the stratospheric tracers and tro-*
46 *pospheric tracers. In this case, a stratospheric branch is formed by the air mass with*
47 *widely varying O₃ VMRs and low PAN VMRs, and a tropospheric branch is formed by*

1 *air mass with low O₃ VMRs and high, widely varying PAN VMRs. We proceed to exam-*
2 *ine the O₃-PAN relationship to identify mixing between stratospheric and tropospheric*
3 *air.*

- 4 **7. p.5054ff. (Also in this respect,) I do not see the sense of the given**
5 **discussion of the PAN-O₃ slopes. What can we learn from them?**
6 **Something on chemical processing, see also my comment above?**
7 **PAN is a medium-lived compound; thus, the slopes in the exTL**
8 **and the background above the exTL should tell us something**
9 **about trans- port/mixing times. Is the stratospheric background**
10 **of 50 pptv real? PAN is quite different to CO, as LT air is poor**
11 **and UT air is rich in PAN. Thus, the information we gain from**
12 **PAN should be different to the one from CO.**

13 The stratospheric PAN background of 50 to 70 ppt was also retrieved from MIPAS
14 satellite measurements and thus seems rather reliable. The main task of the cor-
15 relation coefficients is to allow the categorisation of air masses. That aside, the
16 coefficients are also be compared to similar analyses carried through with polluted
17 boundary layer air; as the coefficients for the high ozone VMR anomaly in the tro-
18 posphere are similar to that of aged polluted boundary layer air is also one puzzle
19 stone validating the high observed O₃ values.

20 References

- 21 Austin, J., Garcia, R. R., Russell III, J. M., Solomon, S., and Tuck, A. F.: On the
22 Atmospheric Chemistry of Nitric Acid, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 91, 5477–5485, doi:10.1029/
23 JD091iD05p05477, 1986.
- 24 Hints, E. J., Boering, K. A., Weinstock, E. M., Anderson, J. G., Gary, B. L., Pfister,
25 L., Daube, B. C., Wofsy, S. C., Loewenstein, M., Podolske, J. R., Margitan, J. J.,
26 and Bui, T. P.: Troposphere-to-stratosphere transport in the lowermost stratosphere
27 from measurements of H₂O, CO₂, N₂O and O₃, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 25, 2655–2658,
28 doi:10.1029/98GL01797, 1998.
- 29 Hoor, P., Fischer, H., Lange, L., Lelieveld, J., and Brunner, D.: Seasonal variations of a
30 mixing layer in the lowermost stratosphere as identified by the CO-O₃ correlation from
31 in situ measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 4004, doi:10.1029/2000JD000289, 2002.
- 32 Konopka, P. and Pan, L. L.: On the mixing-driven formation of the Extratropical Transi-
33 tion Layer (ExTL), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D18 301, doi:10.1029/2012JD017876, 2012.
- 34 Morris, G. A., Considine, D. B., Dessler, A. E., Kawa, S. R., Kumer, J., Mergenthaler, J.,
35 Roche, A., and Russell III, J. M.: Nitrogen partitioning in the middle stratosphere as
36 observed by the Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 8955–8965,
37 doi:10.1029/97JD00073, 1997.

- 1 Murphy, D. M., Fahey, D. W., Proffitt, M. H., Liu, S. C., Chan, K. R., Eubank, C. S.,
2 Kawa, S. R., and Kelly, K. K.: Reactive Nitrogen and Its Correlation With Ozone
3 in the Lower Stratosphere and Upper Troposphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 8751–8773,
4 doi:10.1029/92JD00681, 1993.
- 5 Pan, L. L., Randel, W. J., Gary, B. L., Mahoney, M. J., and Hints, E. J.: Definitions and
6 sharpness of the extratropical tropopause: A trace gas perspective, *J. Geophys. Res.*,
7 109, D23 103, doi:10.1029/2004JD004982, 2004.
- 8 Pan, L. L., Bowman, K. P., Shaphiro, M., Randel, W. J., Gao, R.-S., Campos, T., Favis,
9 C., Schauffler, S., Ridley, B. A., Wei, J. C., and Barnett, C.: Chemical behavior of the
10 tropopause observed during the Stratosphere-Troposphere Analyses of Regional Trans-
11 port (START) experiment, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D18 110, doi:10.1029/2007JD008645,
12 2007.
- 13 Roberts, J. M.: The atmospheric chemistry of organic nitrates, *Atmospheric Environment*.
14 Part A. General Topics, 24, 243 – 287, doi:10.1016/0960-1686(90)90108-Y, 1990.
- 15 Singh, H. B., Salas, L., Herlth, D., Kolyer, R., Czech, E., Avery, M., Crawford, J. H.,
16 Pierce, R. B., Sachse, G. W., Blake, D. R., Cohen, R. C., Bertram, T. H., Perring, A.,
17 Wooldridge, P. J., Dibb, J., Huey, G., Hudman, R. C., Turquety, S., Emmons, L. K.,
18 Flocke, F., Tang, Y., Carmichael, G. R., and Horowitz, L. W.: Reactive nitrogen distri-
19 bution and partitioning in the North American troposphere and lowermost stratosphere,
20 *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D12S04, doi:10.1029/2006JD007664, 2007.
- 21 Stephens, E. R.: The formation, reactions, and properties of peroxyacyl nitrates (PANS)
22 in photochemical air pollution, *Advances in Environmental Science*, 1, 119–147, 1969.