

Interactive comment on “Impacts of an unknown daytime nitrous acid source on its daytime concentration and budget, as well as those of hydroxyl, hydroperoxyl, and organic peroxy radicals, in the coastal regions of China” by Y. Tang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 12 February 2015

General comments: The manuscript tried to quantify the impact of the unknown HONO source on the concentrations and budgets of HONO, HOx radicals and RO₂ radicals in the eastern coast of China by utilizing a model simulation and parameterized unknown HONO source strength. To fulfil this meaningful aim, reasonable parameterization of HONO source and uncertainty analysis of the results are important. However, the uncertainty analysis is not found in the manuscript and the parameterization is not fully

C189

justified. Hence, this manuscript is recommended to be published in Atmos. Chem. Phys. unless both parameterization justification and uncertainty analysis are well addressed.

Specific comments:

1. parameterization justification:

A. HONO emission is considered. In page 812, line 6-7, you stated that an emission ratio of 2.3% for HONO/NO₂ used in other study is relatively high. However, in page 814, line 15, you choose to use the same ratio of 0.023 in your model. Please explain.

B. You noticed that HONO chemistry is different near the surface and over the surface within 1000 m. Is this difference explained by the NO₂, J(NO₂) and aerosol surface density? Why NO₂ heterogeneous reactions on ground surface is not considered in your model?

C. In page 811, photo-enhanced heterogeneous reactions and photolysis of surface-adsorbed HNO₃ are summarized as HONO sources. Why these two sources are excluded in your model?

D. The unknown source strength ($19.60 \cdot \text{NO}_2 \cdot \text{S/V}$) is fitted using HONO measurement globally. Is it good for China eastern coast?

2. uncertainty analysis

A. How the uncertainty in parameterization on HONO source impact the model simulation? What kind of improvement have you made compared to previous model work?

B. How the model itself and these inputs affect the model output?

C. The model-observation difference is quite considerable in Fig. 4-6. How to make sure your results is a trustful one?

3. In page 809, line 15-17: other OH primary sources, such as HCHO photolysis, is

C190

widely accepted. Add them!

4. In page 809, line 27: if daytime HONO could reach ppb level, it is within the detect limit of most HONO measurement instruments. Do you mean specific instrument here?

5. In page 813, line 10-14: ambient HONO is correlated with NO₂ as a result of secondary HONO formation instead of HONO direct emission since HONO photolysis lifetime is only about 15 min in the noontime. So why the correlation is the reason for that HONO/NO_x ratio is used as a HONO emission factor?

6. In page 814, line 4-7: an annular denuder and an absorption photometer were used for HONO measurement. How are their results comparing to, such as DOAS? How are they compared to each other?

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/15/C189/2015/acpd-15-C189-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 807, 2015.