

## ***Interactive comment on “Nighttime measurements of HO<sub>x</sub> during the RONOCO project and analysis of the sources of HO<sub>2</sub>” by H. M. Walker et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 19 February 2015

Walker et al present nighttime measurements of NO<sub>3</sub> and HO<sub>2</sub> during aircraft campaigns over the UK and on occasion observe close correlation between these radicals. Their analysis indicates that both NO<sub>3</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> reactions with alkenes are important for production of HO<sub>x</sub> and that nighttime oxidation in the summer proceeds at a faster rate than daytime oxidation in the winter. The manuscript is suitable for publication following minor corrections.

P2999 L21 The oxidising capacity of the atmosphere is described as its “ability“ to remove trace gases. While capacity is a physical and quantifiable characteristic of a system, ability is not. Please reword.

P3008 L23-26 Why were equal concentrations of HO<sub>2</sub> and RO<sub>2</sub> used to constrain the

C299

model ? The sentence “the model was run until the model interference . . . . matched the interference measured in the interference experiments” is clumsy. Please re-word and state how the model was tuned to get it to match.

P3008 L28 “interference measurements described above”. There is no description of the so-called interference experiments, only a citation to Whalley.

P3009 L14 After describing the corrections for HO<sub>2</sub> and deriving alkene dependent correction factors for the HO<sub>2</sub> measurements the authors then state that the correction (on average 14 %) was not made If they trust the correction, they should apply it to the data.

P3011 L10 Wall losses of NO<sub>3</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> were determined prior to and after each flight. What was the variability in this parameter and how large the correction factor ? The total uncertainty in the NO<sub>3</sub> measurement is given as 11 %. This seems too low, especially considering that the NO<sub>3</sub>-transmission of the aircraft inlet is unknown.

P3015 L17 Is the value of 0.6 (equation5) valid for all VOCs ? The authors should consider giving some examples of F<sub>RO</sub> for a few different alkenes.

P3017 L24 “the seasonal difference in NO<sub>3</sub> concentrations may have been the result of lower temperatures.” As the temperatures, the equilibrium constants and NO<sub>2</sub> levels are known this statement can be confirmed and quantified.

P3021. The authors calculate the rate of HO<sub>2</sub> production assuming that the losses of NO<sub>3</sub> are completely accounted for by the alkenes measured. Based on this assumption, the authors should also be able to calculate the steady-state mixing ratios of NO<sub>3</sub> as the production term (via O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub>) is known. They will find that the NO<sub>3</sub> concentrations calculated this way are too high as the true overall loss rate is actually not known.

Indeed on page 3023 the authors show that the model used also over-predicts NO<sub>3</sub>. The authors then state that the discrepancy between modelled and measured NO<sub>3</sub>

C300

helps to explain the model overprediction of the role of NO<sub>3</sub> in HO<sub>2</sub> generation. I'm not sure if this is correct. If the model does not account for the losses of NO<sub>3</sub> with hydrocarbons that were not measured it will generate more N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (as the model NO<sub>3</sub> lifetime increases) and thus underestimate the rate of oxidation of VOCs by NO<sub>3</sub> and thus also UNDERpredict the rate of RO<sub>2</sub> production.

P3023 L15. Data from flight B537 were excluded owing to atypical observations of HO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>3</sub>, O<sub>3</sub> and "other chemical species". What does atypical mean? Sometimes "atypical" events can be a better test of our understanding of chemical processes than analysis of only the data that we a priori expect to find.

P3026 L 29 "and others" is not a useful reference.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 2997, 2015.