

Interactive comment on “Overview of the Mount Tai Experiment (MTX2006) in Central East China in June 2006: studies of significant regional air pollution” by Y. Kanaya et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 12 March 2013

This paper is to provide an overview of the MTX2006 campaign. Both the objectives and the major findings of MTX2006 were given briefly. In general, the manuscript is well organized and is helpful to catching the whole picture of MTX2006. Thus, it doubtless merits publication at this ACP special issue. The followings are my comments and suggestion for the potential revision of this manuscript.

1. It was indicated that the general objective of MTX2006 was to quantify the air quality in the region. However, according to the aims listed in Sec 2 and the published papers of MTX2006, it is very much an atmospheric chemistry experiment with focus at ozone and aerosols. Thus, as an overview paper, the readers would expect to see a

C525

synthesis discussion upon the air quality implications of the great scientific findings. 2. The boundary layer dynamics is among the major mechanisms controlling the diurnal variations of the measurements of gaseous and aerosol species. Do you have a paper discussing the influences of boundary layer and/or general meteorological conditions during MTX2006? If not, I'd like to suggest giving a summary in this overview paper. 3. (P1538) It was indicated that “In conclusion, the air quality at the top of Mt Tai is comparable to that in the outflow region or even the urban Beijing”. However, the above “conclusion” was drawn merely from the measurements of OC and EC in aerosols. I suggest making the conclusion specifically on the levels of carbonaceous aerosols (i.e. OC and EC) instead of generally on “air quality”. 4. (P1539 and Fig 6) It was observed that “BC showed high concentrations in early morning”. What were the potential sources of the early morning BC (without substantial increases in CO)? 5. (P1539) I cannot follow the calculation of aerosol radiative forcing. How did you obtain the value of 55W/m² for aerosol RF? Besides, please note that the DRF efficiency given in IPCC (2007) is associated with substantial uncertainties. 6. (P1541) The authors argued that the high O₃ in June at Mt Tai was due to biomass burning. However, as indicated there, the average impacts of OCRB to O₃ was only 6%. Thus, it seems that the conclusions did not get support from the results of data analysis. 7. (P1542-1543) Regarding the attribution of O₃, it was indicated in Sec 6.3 that “photochemistry in the surrounding region is more dominant than transport”. However, in Sec 6.4, it was argued that “O₃ transport is more important than in-situ photochemistry”. Thus, the results from the two studies disagree with each other and could confuse the readers. 8. (P1544 and Figure 4) OPE_x of 5.8 was derived from the measurements of O₃ and NO_z and, as indicated the authors, is comparable to the OPE_x around Beijing. However, Beijing is known as an urban area where O₃ production is mostly limited by VOC, whereas Mt Tai case was suggested to be NO_x-limited. Actually, in a NO_x-limited case, the production of NO_z should be retarded and thereby the OPE_x is expected much higher the observed level. Please include further evidences to support the “NO_x-limited” conclusion. 9. (P1545 and Figure 4) Higher OPE_x given by model was indicated but did not get well

C526

explained. Comparing Figure 4c with 4f, I wonder if the model had underestimated the formation of NO_z and therefore gave higher OPE_x. 10. (P1551) It was shown that peaks of organic aerosol tracers of biomass burning were observed in early morning. This is consistent with the early morning BC peak shown in Figure 6. I'd like to suggest incorporating the data of organic tracers and BC to investigate the transport of biomass burning BC in this region.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 1527, 2013.

C527