Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions

Open Access

Interactive comment on "The global tropospheric ammonia distribution as seen in the 13 year AIRS measurement record" *by* J. X. Warner et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 February 2016

In this manuscript, observations made from the Atmospheric Infrared Sounder (AIRS) in the spectral region between 860 and 967 cm-1 are used in a forward model to deduce NH3 concentrations, averaging kernels and degrees of freedom for signal. As the authors note, other satellite-borne IR spectrometers, including IASI and TES, also provide retrievals for ammonia on a global scale. The challenge for all such measurements is that NH3 mixing ratios are typically at a maximum within tens or hundreds of meters of the Earth's surface, whereas the retrieval is most sensitive at higher altitudes. Further compounding the challenge is that chemical transport models often struggle to reproduce the diel behaviour of NH3, and its vertical distribution in the atmosphere in the few regions where in situ measurements are available for comparison.

Throughout the paper, the authors conflate high observed volume mixing ratios (VMRs)

retrieved at 918 hPa with high emissions at that location. It is not necessarily the case that high VMRs observed aloft correspond to high emissions directly below the retrieval, especially given the importance of wildfires to high signal at 918 hPa. Even if the VMR is related to local emissions, the retrieved quantity will also depend on the degree of vertical mixing and the impacts of sinks such as deposition and gas-particle partitioning. I think the language used in the manuscript is somewhat misleading since it implies that elevated VMRs at 918 hPa are uniquely associated with elevated emissions. Since the authors restrict themselves to only three pollution scenarios to serve as a priori profiles, it may be a convenient shorthand but it can lead to misleading statements about the interpretation of the retrievals.

In Section 3, the authors use in situ measurements from the DISCOVER-AQ field campaign in California during the winter of 2013 to evaluate retrieval profiles. These aircraft profiles are useful, in that they occur in a significant source region, which may be expected to correspond to the 'high pollution' a priori. On the other hand, there is significant heterogeneity, with individual aircraft profiles corresponding to the same satellite retrieval measuring mixing ratios that differ by an order of magnitude close to the surface. This section ends without a clear statement about the quality of the retrieval methodology, as evaluated using this comparison.

In Section 4, the authors apply the methodology to the globe from 2002-2015. As they state, interpreting the analysis requires not only consideration of the average VMR at 918 hPa, but also the frequency of elevated 'emissions' (actually VMRs > 1.0 ppbv at 918 hPa), and also the retrieval DOFs. It appears that many of the regions with the highest average VMRs are in places with infrequent occurrences of high emissions, probably related to episodic wildfires. Given that the relationship between VMR at 918 hPa and emission is likely very different for agricultural and wildfire emissions, it becomes challenging to use the retrievals to constrain the global budget of NH3. Furthermore, the authors state that regions where DOFs are never above 0.1 are excluded from the analysis. But what about regions where DOFs are < 0.1 the majority of the

time, but are occasionally impacted by wildfire. Is the average VMR reported for that pixel simply the average of the high signal episodes, or the average of the entire time period, in which case a significant fraction of the time the retrieval is probably indistinguishable from the a priori?

I did not find Figure 6, and the associated discussion to add significantly to the manuscript. It is to be expected that fertilizer use and animal husbandry will dominate 'persistent sources' of NH3 on a global scale, so what new information is gained here?

Specific Comments Lines 45-47 – References would be good for these statements, particularly that idea that NH3 deposition increases emissions of CH4.

Lines 52-72 – In the second paragraph of the introduction, it's difficult to tell if the authors are stating that they used the NH3 fields generated in the Park et al., 2004 study, or whether they ran GEOS-Chem themselves using the methods described in Park et al., 2004. Later, it is mentioned that v9-02 was used – this information should be clarified in the introductory paragraph.

Lines 9-99 – This sentence is a bit confusing. Does the 'both' in 'if both are large enough' refer to the concentrations and thermal contrast, or retrieval and radiative transfer model runs. One assumes the former, but it's hard to tell from the sentence.

Line 142 – Sentence refers to the contributions of co-authors Strow and Hannon, but Hannon does not appear in the author list of this manuscript

L185-187 Why is the a priori developed for 2003-2012 when it is applied for observations between 2002-2015?

L186 and Figure 1. I find the use of 'level' for the three different versions of the a priori somewhat confusing because it makes me think of vertical levels. Perhaps using the term 'emission scenarios' instead of 'emission levels' would be more clear? Also, it would be interesting to know if the three scenarios differ in terms of shape or just

overall levels. This could be shown with an additional panel in which each scenario is shown normalized to the surface concentration.

L196-198 How significant are the adjustments and extrapolations mentioned here?

Figure 3 – it's too difficult to distinguish between the solid and dashed green lines in the figure panels

L 318-320 Can the authors clarify why they excluded the nighttime retrievals carried out at 01:30? Measurements of NH3 in the residual layer would be valuable.

Section 5 - Can the seasonality in the retrievals be uniquely attributed to seasonality in column NH3 or the VMR at 918 hPa?

Technical comments L79 remove 'the' before Beijing'

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 35823, 2015.