

Interactive comment on “Validation of NO₂ and NO from the Atmospheric Chemistry Experiment (ACE)” by T. Kerzenmacher et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 March 2008

General comments:

The authors present a very detailed validation study of the short-lived trace species NO₂ and NO obtained from solar occultation measurements by the Atmospheric Chemistry Experiment (ACE) using an infrared Fourier Transform Spectrometer (ACE-FTS) and an ultraviolet-visible-near-infrared spectrometer (MAESTRO). An overall good agreement is found between ACE-FTS NO₂ and NO, MAESTRO NO₂, and the correlative satellite-, balloon-, and ground-based observations. The manuscript is clearly written and well structured and will be of large interest to all potential users of the corresponding ACE data. I recommend publishing this manuscript in ACP after addressing the following comments below.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Specific comments:

Page 3029, lines 13 to 20 (abstract) and page 3078, lines 19 to 26 (conclusions): The authors mention typical deviations between the ACE instruments and the correlative observations. Unfortunately, no characterization of ACE systematic errors seems to be available to date. Concerning statistical errors: Is the precision of the ACE instruments (as described in sections 2.1 and 2.2) confirmed by the validation comparison? For instance, is the standard deviation of the difference between ACE instruments and the correlative ones comparable to their combined random errors? It would be fine if the authors could add a clarifying sentence in the last paragraph of the conclusions and in the abstract.

Page 3029, line 14: Please write out the acronym "VMR" since it occurs the first time in the abstract.

Page 3029, line 18 and page 3078, line 25: Partial NO₂ columns between ACE instruments and the FTIRs are in "fair" agreement in the abstract and in "good" agreement in the conclusions. I suggest writing in both cases "quite good" agreement.

Page 3042, lines 6 and 8: Precision and accuracy values for the data retrieval are given in absolute units. However, since volume mixing ratios of both species are varying considerably with altitude it would be better to give such error estimates in relative (percentage) units.

Page 3047, lines 14 and 15: Why do the FTIR stations in Kiruna and Izana use the old HITRAN spectroscopic data while the other stations in the NDACC network use the newer ones? For the molecule NO₂ there has been an update in spectroscopy. This can alter NO₂ volume mixing ratios, at least in the limb emission case, by roughly 10 to 15% (see, e.g., Fig. 9 in Wetzal et al. 2008).

Page 3052, line 13: The text in parentheses "including the updates for ozone" can be omitted since "ozone" occurs already at the end of this sentence.

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

Interactive
Comment

Page 3056, line 2: MAESTRO values are larger than SAGE II by 15 to 30% between 20 and about 40 km (Fig. 12). Please change "35 km" to "about 40 km".

Page 3056, line 13: The reference to Fig. 14 should be moved to the end of the sentence before since the comparison ACE-FTS to POAM III is shown (and not: MAESTRO to POAM III).

Page 3056, line 18: What do you mean with "relative increase"? Relative to what? Why only below 25 km? Please rewrite this sentence to make it more clearly.

Page 3058, line 26: Please add the clause "and more than 100% below 18 km" at the end of the sentence.

Page 3059, line 8: "...slightly tighter criteria were chosen...". A tighter coincidence criterion normally decreases (not increases) the number of coincidences. Hence, something must be wrong in this sentence. Please correct it.

Page 3061, line 5: Why is the diurnal correction only important below 25 km? Could you please explain this a little bit?

Page 3065, line 29: "...the sensitivity of the FTIR measurements, which was required to be 0.5 or greater..." What do you mean with this? Is it the signal to noise ratio? Please explain this more clearly.

Page 3066, line 26: I am not convinced that the correlation shown in Fig. 25 is excellent; I think "good" is more appropriate. Is the scatter seen in the Kiruna data related with measurements inside and outside the vortex. What is the comparison period here? The comparison period should be included in the Figure caption of Figure 25 or as an additional column in Table 1.

Page 3074, line 10: If I understand this right, the problem is that the retrieval grid and the model atmospheres of the ground-based stations end at 100 km. High NO values above this altitude must then be compensated by too high values in the actual layers below this upper altitude limit leading to a high bias. Hence, from my point of view it

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

would be more clearly to write "as the retrieval grid and the model atmospheres of the ground-based stations extend only to 100 km" instead of mentioning averaging kernels here.

Page 3075, line 25: Please rewrite the sentence like: "MAESTRO reports larger values than ACE-FTS in the lower and middle stratosphere (see Fig. 6)". Since in the upper stratosphere, the situation is vice versa.

Technical corrections:

Page 3030, line 7: The citation Wolff et al. (2007) should be changed to the year 2008.

Page 3030, line 10, and page 3094, line 16: Strong et al. (2007) should also be changed to the year 2008.

Page 3031, line 10: The citation Nakajima et al. (2006) occurs also in line 11 and should therefore be deleted in line 10.

Page 3031, line 18: Please delete the word "instruments" between "Experiment" and "GOME".

Page 3050, line 2: Dupuy et al. (2007) should also be changed to the year 2008.

Page 3054, line 24: The word "comparison" should be plural.

Page 3065, line 3: One "n" is missing in the word "lightning".

Page 3068, lines 22 and 26: The exponent before "molec" should probably be "15" instead of "13".

Page 3077, line 6: Please insert an "e" in the name "Aire-sur-l'Adour".

Page 3114, Figure 11 (a): Please write "SAGE II" in the legend (instead of "SAGE2").

Page 3129, Figure caption 26, line 3: Please write "comparison" instead of "compan-ion".

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

Page 3134 to 3137: Please change "MIPAS" to "MIPAS IMK-IAA" in the Figure captions 31-34 to make it more clearly that this is not MIPAS ESA data here. Please add the character "r" in the word "February" in Figure caption 32, line 1.

References:

Wetzel, G., Sugita, T., Nakajima, H., Tanaka, T., Yokota, T., Friedl-Vallon, F., Kleinert, A., Maucher, G., and Oelhaf, H.: Technical Note: Intercomparison of ILAS-II version 2 and 1.4 trace species with MIPAS-B measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 1119-1126, 2008.

[Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.](#), 8, 3027, 2008.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

