

Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on “Observations and analysis of polar stratospheric clouds detected by POAM III and SAGE III during the SOLVE II/VINTERSOL campaign in the 2002/2003 Northern Hemisphere winter” by J. Alfred et al.***

**J. Alfred et al.**

Received and published: 12 March 2007

We thank the referee for his/her comments and respond to each on a point-by-point basis.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 January 2007

Interactive Comment on "Observations and analysis of polar stratospheric clouds detected by POAM III and SAGE III during the SOLVE II / VINTERSOL campaign in the 2002/2003 Northern Hemisphere winter" by J. Alfred et al.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

## Summary of paper ———

This study presents an analysis of remotely-sensed observations of polar stratospheric clouds from the 2002/3 Northern Hemisphere winter made by the SAGE III and POAM III instruments aboard the METEOR-3M and SPOT 4 polar-orbiting satellites (respectively). The paper generates an important combined SAGE-POAM PSC dataset to give a wide coverage of the vortex over the winter. Careful calibration of the two datasets is carried out to ensure consistency of background aerosol extinction. The number of profiles which detected PSCs is reported for the two satellite instruments as well as the change in occurrence frequency of solid (type 1a) PSCs and liquid (type 1b) PSCs over periods of the 2002/3 Arctic winter. The main result of the paper however, concerns the relationship between a derived PSC observation frequency, (calculated using an automated PSC detection algorithm) and the temperature relative to the saturation temperature for nitric acid tri-hydrate (NAT) particles. Note that for these purposes, TNAT is calculated using a nitric acid profile prior to denitrification. It is found that early in the winter, PSCs are detected at temperatures near TNAT whilst later in the winter, temperatures are required to be several degrees below TNAT before PSCs are observed. This shift in derived PSC occurrence temperature is attributed to the sedimentation of large nitric acid containing PSCs (denitrification) reducing the nitric acid concentration, hence also reducing the NAT saturation temperature (below its non-denitrified value). The authors go on to infer that denitrification of 80% must have occurred to explain the observed shift in PSC occurrence temperature.

## General comments ———

The paper addresses an important topic as the temperature at which polar stratospheric clouds exist and the extent of stratospheric denitrification caused by sedimenting PSCs are both critical to understanding the extent of ozone loss in the polar stratosphere. The combined SAGE-POAM dataset is also of importance for models to help evaluate our understanding of these processes. The paper is interesting and the reader is taken through the results in a well-structured way. In general the paper is fairly well-

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

written, although section 4.1 (pages 11405,6) and would benefit from some re-writing (see specific comments). Also the terminology of "PSC occurrence temperature" is sometimes described as "PSC formation temperature" which should be avoided as it implies that it is related in some way to the nucleation mechanism. Overall the paper is worthy of addition to ACP once the comments have been addressed. I agree however with Referee 1 that the limitations of the method for deriving the extent of denitrification should be clearly stated. The discrepancies between the other observations should also be explored in more detail in light of these limitations.

Authors Response: We have removed the terminology "PSC formation temperature" unless we are specifically discussing PSC formation. Section 4.1 has been given sub-sections to make it clearer and Sect. 4.1.1 has been rewritten as discussed in more detail below. More discussion has been added to Sect. 4.2 as well as comparisons to MIPAS-E denitrification to assess some of the limitations of the methodology.

Specific Comments ———

Referee Comment: Page 11392 line 16 (Abstract) Suggest inserting "(using a nitric acid profile prior to denitrification)" after "NAT saturation point".

Authors response: Added.

Referee Comment: Section 1: introduction Since the main focus of the paper is to look at the shift in PSC occurrence temperatures, a brief description of the various types of PSCs should be included and also the various nucleation mechanisms responsible for their production and temperatures at which they form with references. Also, since the paper is inferring a value of denitrification, the motivation for understanding denitrification should be more clearly stated with regard to prolonging chlorine activation and thus enhancing polar ozone loss. The introduction should also be expanded to include a summary of other studies which present observed and modeled denitrification for the 2002/3 winter (Grooss et al 2005; Davies et al, 2006) and it should be set in the context of that which occurred in other Arctic winters (see Davies et al, 2005; Mann et

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

al, 2003).

Authors Response: We have added a paragraph to the introduction outlining the different PSC phases and the formation temperatures of each.

Referee Comment: Section 3.1 Page 11397 line 15: the authors use a 3-sigma value for the threshold when using the Fromm et al (2003) Unified detection algorithm. The Fromm paper suggests using a 6-sigma value to be sure that a PSC is detected and a 3-sigma for a less definite detection. Please explain why the 3-sigma threshold is used.

Authors Response: Fromm et al. [2003] use the term 'marginal' to categorize aerosol extinction enhancements that lie within the 3-6 sigma range. If the temperatures at these marginal enhancements also meet the temperature criteria (i.e.  $T < TNAT + 5K$ ) then they are considered to be PSCs. The 3-6 sigma region in Fig. 5 from Fromm et al. is well separated from the primary BG aerosol distribution and the calculated BG. Fromm et al. [2003] consider the 3-sigma threshold to be very robust and the 6-sigma threshold to be too conservative.

Referee Comment: Page 11398 line 4: the authors mention "aerosol cleansing inside the vortex". Please explain.

Authors Response: We have added "Ěcaused by descent of low aerosol-containing air from higher altitudes and sedimentation of pre-existing PSCs."

Referee Comment: Section 3.2 Page 11399 line 3: be more specific than "about the same temperature very near TNAT" – from the Figure it seems to be around TNAT +/-3K.

Authors Response: The text has been changed to "Ěsuggesting PSC activation in the temperature region of  $-3 K < TNAT < +3 K$ ."

Referee Comment: Page 11399 line 26: presumably in Figure 6 the SAGE profile has been corrected – if so please state.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Authors Response: The SAGE profile does not have the bias-compensation applied. This is now noted in the text.

Referee Comment: Page 11400 line 8: rather than stating that both instruments see a PSC from 460 to 575K, be more specific and state that the algorithm gives POAM detecting a PSC between 460 and 570K and SAGE detecting one between 480 and 590K. Thickness is the same (110K) in both but 20K offset.

Authors Response: This Fig. was incorrect, with an altitudinal offset on the SAGE profile. The corrected Fig. reflects the text as written.

Referee Comment: Page 11401 line 10: It is not mentioned that there is a signal of around 15% at  $-2 < \text{TTNAT} < 0$  in the SAGE statistics in Figure 7. Is this of physical significance?

Authors Response: The mode in the SAGE statistics at  $-2\text{K} < \text{TNAT} < 1\text{K}$  yet does not appear in the POAM statistics is due to two factors: i) To reduce wear on the azimuth motor POAM conducted measurements only in sunset mode (i.e. In the Southern Hemisphere) on 2 January. SAGE conducted measurements of PSCs on that day in this temperature region. ii) On the days that POAM was functioning the PSCs that were detected by SAGE were of modest enhancement levels only a few sigma above the 3-sigma detection threshold. The corresponding POAM measurements do show small features in the aerosol extinction but only reach enhancement levels of near 2 sigma, thus they are not categorized as PSCs.

Referee Comment: Page 11402 line 27: state the extent of the MkIV observed denitrification ( $\check{Y}4$  ppbv at 550K) at 550K.

Authors Response: Added.

Referee Comment: End of Page 11402 :Also state the derived denitrification observed by MIPAS-E – around 6 ppbv by end of December at 505K for equivalent latitude  $\check{Y} 75$  degrees (see Davies et al 2005).

Authors Response: Davies et al. 2005 does not include an analysis of the 2002/2003 winter. I am unable to find this explicitly stated in Davies et al. 2006. It is also difficult to infer this from any of the Figs in Davies et al. 2006.

Referee Comment: End of Page 11402 : Also note in text that in Figure 8 there are regions 500K-600K where  $T < TNAT$  but no PSCs observed – presumably this is also due to denitrification removing nitric acid and hence reducing TNAT below its value in non-denitrified conditions?

Authors Response: We have added the following to address this point: “Beginning in late-December Fig. 8 also shows areas where the air is saturated with respect to NAT, yet few PSCs exist. This too is also likely a sign of denitrification as  $HNO_3$  depleted air would decrease TNAT as compared to its non-denitrified value.”

Referee Comment: Section 3.3 Page 11403 In Table 1, the composition is shown for the periods Dec 1-10, Dec 21-30 and Jan 1- 10. Why is the period December 11-20 omitted – this was a period with considerable PSCs. The authors should ideally include this period or if there is a good reason for omitting it state it. Also include this period in the other similar tables later in the paper.

Authors Response: The December 11-20 time-period was omitted because there is no significant temperature shift in PSC occurrence temperature from the December 1-10 time-period. Adding this curve to Fig. 9 adds clutter without adding information. Table 1 originally was only discussed in the context of the discussion of Fig. 9, so it was omitted. When the discussion of Table 1 was expanded beyond this context in Sect. 3.3 we neglected to add this information. We have now added this time-period to Table 1. However, because the information in the other tables applies specifically to the inference of denitrification, which is not enhanced with the inclusion of the December 11-20 time-period, the time-period has not been added to them. We do however now note in the text that there was no significant change in PSC occurrence temperature from December 1-10 to December 11-20 as an explanation as to why it is missing. We

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

have also changed the order of Tables 2 and 3 because Table 3 is referred to prior to Table 2.

Referee Comment: In section 3.3, possible causes for the increase in Type 1b PSCs compared with Type 1a PSCs should be included. Is this just a reflection of a lower temperature regime? Also the impact on PSC observation frequency and occurrence temperature of a change in PSC composition should be clearly explained here.

Authors Response: The increase in Type 1B PSCs in the January 1-10 time-frame is likely not a reflection of a lower temperature regime. The temperatures in this time-frame are consistent with those December 21-20 as can be seen from Fig. 3. A more likely explanation is that the air sampled in January is heavily denitrified thus inhibiting the potential growth of PSC particles to large NAT. We have added this possible explanation to the text.

Referee Comment: Section 4.1 Page 11404: lines 19-30–It would be better to refer to potential temperature intervals rather than potential temperature bins and similarly better to refer to time periods than time bins.

Authors Response: Changed.

Referee Comment: Page 11405: line 7 – the authors should clearly define what is meant by "PSC occurrence temperature". The technique by which it is calculated is described but since the authors are not trying to equate this with the temperature at which the particles were nucleated, why is the term "PSC formation temperature" used here? I would recommend solely using the term "PSC occurrence temperature" to avoid confusion.

Authors Response: All references to the term "PSC formation temperatures" have been changed to "PSC occurrence temperature" unless the text specifically refers to PSC formation/nucleation.

Referee Comment: Page 11405: line 11 – insert i), ii) and iii) before the 3 alternative

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

possibilities for the shift in PSC occurrence temperature.

Authors Response: Added.

Referee Comment: Pages 11405-11407 This section is rather difficult to read as it is just one big block of text. Suggest putting subsections in as 4.1.1. Change in PSC composition, 4.1.2 Possible biases in Met Office temperatures, 4.1.3 Dehydration etc.

Authors Response: Subsection labeling has been added.

Referee Comment: Page 11405: line 15-26–this section is rather unclear. Presumably by the phrase "4K decrease in Type 1B PSC formation temperature relative to Type 1A formation temperature", the authors mean "difference" rather than "decrease" and are they referring to a difference between TNAT and TSTS (the temperature below which Type 1b PSCs are observed). This should be written more clearly.

Authors Response: This has been reworded to: "As discussed in Bevilacqua et al. [2002], under equivalent ambient conditions the Type 1B PSC formation temperature is approximately 4 K lower than the Type 1A PSC formation temperature [Tabazadeh et al., 1994]. This means that a change in the relative

Referee Comment: Page 11405 line 26 - page 11406 line 8 This section should be more succinctly – e.g. "This is an upper limit estimate" is not required if the start of the sentence at line 1 on page 11407 was rephrased. Please re-write.

Authors Response: This section has been rewritten and now adds in a more specific discussion of the limitations in assessing the role of the different PSC phases and their formation temperatures. With the added discussion of the classification methodology in Sect. 3.3 Sect. 4.1.1 should be more lucid.

Referee Comment: Page 11406 line 17 - after "temperatures become biased warm" put in the text the approximate extent of the change in the biases as shown in Table 2 (i.e from -0.3 to +0.9K at 50 hPa).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Authors Response: We have added “Eby 1.2 K and 0.6 K at the 50 and 70 hPa levels respectively”

Referee Comment: Page 11407 Why have the in-situ measurements of water vapour made by the FISH instrument aboard the Geophysica not been mentioned? I understand that no significant dehydration was observed during the denitrification flights. Please state this also to add to the evidence of no dehydration.

Authors Response: A reference to the FISH water vapor results has been added.

Referee Comment: Section 4.2 The comparison with other studies should also take in the denitrification inferred from the MIPAS-E nitric acid observations and the DLAPSE model simulations (Davies et al, 2005) which found maximum denitrification of 80% in the core of the vortex by early January 2003.

Authors Response: A comparison with the MIPAS-E measurements has been added.

Referee Comment: Table 1 caption - State that the percentages shown are for the combined SAGE-POAM dataset.

Authors Response: Added.

Referee Comment: Table 3 caption – Briefly describe how the PSC occurrence temperature is calculated.

Authors Response: This has been defined by adding “PSC occurrence temperature is defined as the PSC observation probability as a function of temperature.” to the caption.

Typos etc. — Referee Comment: Page 11392 line 10 (Abstract) insert "from 15th January" after "either instrument"

Authors Response: Added.

Referee Comment: Page 11392 line 11 (Abstract) insert "from then only" before "spar-

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

ingly"

Authors Response: Added.

Referee Comment: Page 11400 line 20 repace "simply" with "as".

Authors Response: Changed.

Referee Comment: Page 11401 line 5 replace "It should be noted that" with "Note that"

Authors Response: Changed.

Referee Comment: Page 11402 line 14 delete "the" between "below" and "TNAT".

Authors Response: Deleted.

Referee Comment: Page 11402 line 14 replace "tend" with "tending"

Authors Response: Changed.

Referee Comment: Page 11403 line 25 remove "the" between "for" and "HNO<sub>3</sub>"

Authors Response: Removed.

Referee Comment: Page 11425,6 Figure 8,9 – please insert a) and b) in caption and next to Figures as referred to in text.

Authors Response: Inserted in text.

Referee Comment: Page 11426 Figure 9 caption - remove "The data were binned in 2 separate potential temperature bins as indicated" and insert at end of 1st sentence in caption "for potential temperature ranges a) 475-550K, b) 400-475K."

Authors Response: Inserted.

Referee Comment: Page 11426 Figure 9 caption - remove sentences beginning "There is a clear shift..." and "The magnitude of the shifts..." – this sort of description of the results should only be in the text not the caption.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Authors Response: Deleted.

#### References —

3-D microphysical model studies of Arctic denitrification: comparison with observations  
Davies, S. et al, Atmos. Chem. Phys., Vol. 5, pp 3093-3109, 2005.

Testing our understanding of Arctic denitrification using MIPAS-E satellite measurements in winter 2002/2003  
Davies, S. et al, Atmos. Chem. Phys., Vol. 6, pp 3149-3161, 2006.

Simulation of denitrification and ozone loss for the Arctic winter 2002/3. Gross, J.-U. et al, Atmos. Chem. Phys., Vol. 5, pp 1437-1448, 2005.

Factors controlling Arctic denitrification in cold winters of the 1990s  
Mann, G. W. et al, Atmos. Chem. Phys., Vol. 3, pp 403-416, 2003.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 11391, 2006.

ACPD

6, S7182–S7192, 2007

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper