

## ***Interactive comment on “Measurements of the sum of HO<sub>2</sub>NO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub>NO<sub>2</sub> in the remote troposphere” by J. G. Murphy et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 18 December 2003

### **General Comments**

This manuscript describes measurements of two peroxyxynitrate compounds, HO<sub>2</sub>NO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub>NO<sub>2</sub>, that are important to nitrogen oxide chemistry in clean regions. The abundance of HO<sub>2</sub>NO<sub>2</sub> has largely been inferred from models and indirectly from the abundances of HO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> compounds in the past with only one previous measurement. The lack of experimental data shows that observation of these compounds is quite difficult. Although the measurement scheme described in this manuscript appears to be far from perfect, it is a step in the direction of characterizing peroxyxynitrate chemistry. The approach is to infer the concentrations of the two compounds from the difference in the NO<sub>2</sub> signal in a heated and a non-heated inlet, where the heated inlet induces thermal dissociation of the peroxyxynitrates. There are several interferences (e.g., PAN and PPN) that must be accounted for in the difference, making the signal of

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

interest a small difference between large signals. As a result, the scheme seems prone to systematic uncertainties and potential interferences. The authors make a convincing case, however, that the technique does measure the compounds of interest, and they do a reasonable job of dealing with uncertainties. Furthermore, if their arguments are correct, the contribution of the peroxy nitrates is very important to the  $\text{NO}_y$  budget in remote regions.

### Specific comments

1. Page 4, top. The instrument reference given for the specific configuration of the TD-LIF system during TOPSE (Thornton, 2002) is a PhD thesis, which is rather difficult to access. Consequently, a few extra details of the PN measurements should be given in this manuscript, including the temperature and residence time in the heated inlet required to thermally dissociate PN to  $\text{NO}_2$ , and the possible interferences that could arise from this method, such as the fraction of any other components of  $\text{NO}_y$  that would be likely to dissociate at under these conditions to give  $\text{NO}_2$ . Even if potential interferences are estimated to be small, a short (even one sentence) discussion of their importance here would be useful.

2. Page 5, bottom. The correction of the relative humidity dependence of the instrument response to PN seems rather arbitrary and not well justified. It brings up several questions. First, if there is no reason to suspect an RH dependence, how did the authors arrive at this parameter for correction? Are there any potential interferences that could have an RH dependence? Also, the correction is applied evenly to both the TD LIF  $\text{NO}_2$  instrument and the PAN instrument, although the artifact is surely in one or the other since they are based on very different techniques. Does splitting the difference of the suspected error between the two instruments have any consequences for the conclusions reached later on?

3. Page 6 and Figure 2. The figure is not quite as convincing as the discussion would indicate. The ratio of the sum of speciated compounds to  $\text{NO}_y$  does not appear to be

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Print Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

1.2 at small values of calculated PN. It is almost unity to within the error bar and has a value closer to 1.1 than 1.2. On the right side of the graph where the calculations show 40-50% of  $\text{NO}_y$  as  $\Delta\text{PN}$ , the ratio of speciated compounds to  $\text{NO}_y$  is near 80%. Is the  $\text{NO}_y$  measurement likely to be systematically 20% wrong to account for this difference? Given the arbitrary scaling of the RH response of the system with a 24% average increase in the  $\Delta\text{PN}$  concentration, this conclusion appears a bit suspicious.

4. Page 8. The conclusions regarding the importance of overtone photodissociation of  $\text{HO}_2\text{NO}_2$  are interesting. Although no near IR photolysis of  $\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2\text{NO}_2$  has been inferred because it lacks an OH group, C-H stretch overtones in this compound could give it a similar IR degradation pathway.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 3, 5689, 2003.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Print Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)