

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Comparison of total ozone and erythemal UV data from OMI with ground-based measurements at Rome station” by I. Ialongo et al.

I. Ialongo et al.

Received and published: 29 April 2008

Manuscript acpd-2381-2008

"Comparison of total ozone and erythemal UV data from OMI with ground-based measurements at Rome station" by Ialongo et al.

Author comments are in italic

Reviewer 1

We thank reviewer 1 for the positive judgement and the comments. The manuscript was rewritten as suggested by the referee. Each point of the referee comment will be discussed.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



1. I strongly suggest to extend the analysis and to include a more thorough analysis of the causes of the discrepancy between OMI UV and ground measured UV by looking at the aerosol effect. According to my knowledge, (Sellitto et al., 2006) the Brewer instrument of Rome also measures optical depth. I would strongly suggest to compare the OMI UV to ground based measured UV as a function of aerosol optical depth and at the same time as a function of solar zenith angle, if sufficient data are available.

The role of aerosols was investigated by means of AOD at 320.1 nm derived from Brewer measurements. In the section 2.1 (P2386 L20) the following statements will be included in the revised manuscript: "Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) retrievals from Brewer spectrophotometer were obtained using the Langley plot method as described in Sellitto et al. (2006). AODs at 320.1 nm determined at noon during cloudless days from September 2004 to July 2006, will be used to analyse the causes of the difference between OMI and ground-based UV data."

The new reference "Sellitto, P., di Sarra, A. G., and Siani, A. M.: An improved algorithm for the determination of aerosol optical depth in the ultraviolet spectral range from Brewer spectrophotometer observations, J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt., 8, 849-855, doi:10.1088/1464-4258/8/10/005, 2006" will be included.

In section 2.3 the statement at page 2389 L9 will be modified as follows: "The values of $(y_i - x_i)/x_i$ were analysed as a function of the AOD at 320.1 nm at different Solar Zenith Angle (SZA)."

The discussion of the comparison between OMI and ground-based UV data taking into account the AOD is reported in the section 3 of the revised manuscript (see at the end of the answers).

The conclusions on the comparison between OMI and ground-based UV data taking into account the AOD is reported in the section 4 of the revised manuscript (see at the end of the answers).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



The modified figures 6 and 7 (now figures 4 and 5, respectively), including the relative difference between OMI and ground-based EDR as a function of AOD, will be reported in the revised manuscript.

2. OMI UV should also be compared to ground UV during cloudy conditions.

As suggested by the referee 2, in the section 3 the Figures 1 and 2 will be removed and the comparison between ground and OMI UV data taking into account all sky conditions and only clear sky days will be included in the revised manuscript as follows:

In section 2.1: "The Figure 1 shows the comparison between Brewer and YES EDRs at local noon under clear sky (light blue circle) and under all sky (black circle) conditions. During clear sky days the correlation coefficient r is 0.97 and the bias is -2% . The value of r increases to 0.95 and the bias becomes -3% when all conditions were considered. The absolute value of the bias is lower than the estimated accuracy of the Brewer 067 UV irradiance (about 5%). Both Brewer and YES datasets were used for OMI validation exercise."

In section 2.3 the paragraph at page 2389 L3 will be modified as follows: "Ground-based Brewer daily mean total ozone measurements were compared with both OMI-TOMS and OMI-DOAS ozone data. Brewer EDRs at local noon were compared with OMI EDRs, under clear sky and all sky conditions. Furthermore, EDRs at noon and EDDs from YES radiometer were compared with OMI satellite-derived data, in both clear sky and all sky conditions."

The results of the comparison between OMI and ground-based UV data taking into account both clear sky and all sky conditions days are reported in the modified section 3 (see at the end of the answers).

Table 1 will be modified in the revised manuscript by also including the bias and r coefficient for all sky conditions.

The modified figures 3,6,7 and 8 (now figures 1,4,5 and 6, respectively), including data

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



under all sky and only clear sky conditions, will be reported in the revised manuscript.

The conclusions about the comparison between OMI and ground-based UV data taking into account both clear sky and all sky conditions days will be updated in the section 4 of the revised manuscript (see at the end of the answers).

3. An explanation regarding the different dependence of OMI/Brewer and OMI/Yes ratios on solar zenith angle should be provided.

In section 3 the figures showing the dependence of OMI/Brewer and OMI/YES EDRs on SZA will be replaced with the figures showing the dependence on AOD taking into account data with $SZA > 55^\circ$ (Figures 4 and 5 in the revised manuscript). All changes are included in the modified sections 3 and 4 of the manuscript (see at the end of the answers).

4. Some statements and eventually statistical analysis concerning the determination uncertainties due to the difference between the OMI overpass time and solar noon should be made. The best way would be to additionally determine and compare OMI ground UV for the overpass time. If this is not possible optical depth measurements could be used to analyse the magnitude of changes in atmospheric transmittance during the time period between solar noon and OMI overpass. Alternatively, changes in cloudiness during this time period could be analysed.

The discussion of the uncertainty due to the difference between the OMI overpass time and the local solar noon will be reported in the modified sections 3 and 4 of the revised manuscript (see at the end of the answers).

5. Minor remarks:

P. 2382: Abstract. First sentence too long. Make two out of one sentence.

It will be done

P 2382: Abstract: algorithms => algorithms

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



It will be modified

P.2383: ground-based measures => ground based measurements

It will be modified

P. 2383: exhaustively => exhaustively

It will be modified

P. 2384: Mention that the study of Tanskanen et al was for daily doses. Is it Tanskanen et al.(2007) or Tanskanen et al.(2008)? Please check.

It is Tanskanen et al. (2007): Tanskanen, A., Lindfors, A., Maatta, A., Krotkov, N., Herman, J., Kaurola, J., Koskela, T., Lakkala, K., Fioletov, V., Bernhard, J., McHenzie, R., Kondo, Y., O'Neill, M., Slaper, H., den Outer, P., Bais, A. F., and Tamminen, J.: Validation of daily erythemal doses from OMI with ground-based UV measurement data, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D24S44, doi:10.1029/2007JD008830, 2007.

The daily doses will be mentioned.

P.2384 (section 2.1) EDR measures => EDR measurements (Please replace this throughout the whole document)

EDR measures will be replaced by EDR measurements throughout the whole document.

P.2385: participated into => participated in

It will be done

P. 2387: lead an => lead to an

This sentence will be removed

P. 2387: Mention when is approximately the overpass time of OMI.

The overpass time of OMI will be specified

P. 2389: Otherwise => in contrast to the Brewer....

This sentence will be modified

P. 2389: Sentence: Taking into account all sky with respect to clear sky days... is difficult to understand.

The following sentence "Taking into account all sky conditions the biases are slightly larger (1-3% higher) with respect to clear sky days" will be removed.

P. 2390: Please change style of conclusions: make full sentences. e.g. OZONE- The daily... => The comparison of OMI retrieved ozone showed that..

The style of conclusions will be modified as suggested by the referee.

Other remark: EDRs@noon looks like an email address. I would suggest to find a new acronym without @

EDRs@noon will be replaced by EDR at noon.

The new reference "Cohen, J.W.: Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences, 2nd ed., Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988." will be included in the revised manuscript.

Section 3 from page 2388 L13 will be modified in the revised manuscript as follows:

"The validation results are summarized in Table 1 in terms of bias and correlation coefficient (r). The daily means of Brewer total ozone measurements were compared with OMI-TOMS ozone (Fig.2) from September 2004 to December 2006 and OMI-DOAS ozone (Fig.3) from October 2005 to December 2006, for all sky days. OMI ozone slightly underestimates ground-based ozone with a negative bias around -1.8% for OMI-TOMS and -0.7% for OMI-DOAS. Balis et al. (2006) showed that OMI-DOAS comparisons exhibit a solar zenith angle dependence; in this study, any significant dependence on SZA was observed.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Figure 4 (upper panel) shows the comparison between Brewer and OMI EDRs at local noon taking into account all sky (black circle) and clear sky (light blue circle) conditions from September 2004 to July 2006. It can be noticed a positive bias larger in case of all sky conditions (33%) than in cloudless conditions (28%). The correlation coefficient (r) of 0.96 in all sky conditions, increases to 0.99 when clear sky days were selected. The comparison with OMI using EDRs at local noon from YES radiometer (Figure 5 upper panel) shows a bias of 30% and $r=0.91$ under all sky conditions (black circle). When the analysis was restricted to cloudless skies the bias becomes 23% and $r=0.99$ (light blue circle).

The OMI overestimation of ground-based UV measurements may be partly explained with the fact that satellite instruments do not probe well the lower atmospheric layers of urban sites where aerosols play an important role. Because of this, the OMI UV retrievals were compared to ground-based data looking at the aerosol effect. Figures 4 and 5 (lower panels) show the relative difference between ground UV data (Brewer and YES EDRs, respectively) and OMI EDRs as a function of AOD at 320.1 nm for clear sky days. Only data at large SZA ($>55^\circ$) showed a moderate ($r=0.44$ for Brewer) or large ($r=0.57$ for YES radiometer) correlations, according to Cohen (1988). Looking at EDDs for all selected days (Fig. 6 black circle) the bias was 23% and $r=0.97$; a small reduction in the bias value (21%) under cloudless conditions was observed (Fig. 6 light blue circle).

The results of the comparison are summarized in Table 1: the positive values of bias show that OMI data overestimate ground-based measurements. Although for YES UV data the bias values are slightly smaller with respect to Brewer UV data, the difference between OMI and ground-based UV data is still large (bias $>20\%$).

Similar results were found by Weihs et al. (2006) with UV measurements performed at Villeneuve d'Ascq (France) station (near urban site). Furthermore, Bais et al. (2007) confirmed that OMI-derived EDDs overestimate ground-based data by between 20% and 30% at three sites in Greece. Due to the lack of OMI UV data at the overpass time

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

(13:45 Local Time) the comparison at noon can be affected by actual atmospheric conditions at the overpass time. AOD values during the time interval between solar noon and the OMI overpass time were taken into account in order to analyse the magnitude of changes in atmospheric transmittance. The mean relative difference between AOD at overpass time and AOD at local noon is -4% with a high variability (standard deviation larger than 50%). This result shows that the difference in atmospheric conditions between local noon and OMI overpass time can affect the comparison between OMI and ground-based UV data.

Furthermore, a difference between ground-based (GB) and satellite UV irradiances is that ground-based instruments measure the irradiance at a single point while satellite products are an average over a given area (satellite pixel). Because of this, in addition to aerosols, variations of cloudiness, of altitude and of surface albedo within the pixel area can lead to a significant difference between ground-based and OMI UV data. The OMI pixel covers an area of $13 \times 24 \text{ km}^2$ and the distance between the centre of the pixel and the station can vary from 1.7 km to 61.6 km; thus, the atmospheric conditions in an urban site as Rome may not be representative of the pixel area.

Finally, the OMI bias can also be due to the fact that OMI surface UV algorithm does not account for the effect of absorbing aerosols in the boundary layer, where the absorption by the aerosols can be important, mainly in an urban site (Krotkov, 1998; Arola, 2005)."

Section 4 from page 2388 L3 will be modified in the revised manuscript as follows:

"The results of OMI total ozone and erythemal UV data validation by using ground-based high quality measurements at Rome site were shown for all sky conditions.

The comparison of OMI retrieved ozone data with the daily mean ozone values from Brewer spectrophotometer 067 showed a good agreement for both OMI-TOMS (bias=-1.8%) and OMI-DOAS (bias=-0.7%) algorithms. In both cases, comparisons do not show any significant dependence on SZA. EDRs at local noon and EDDs retrieved from YES UVB-1 radiometer were derived from 2000 to 2006 at Rome site in all sky

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

conditions. Noontime EDR retrievals from YES radiometer and Brewer 067 were compared showing a good agreement (bias=-2% for clear skies and bias=-3% for all skies).

The comparisons between OMI and ground-based UV data (both Brewer and YES radiometer data) showed that, on average, OMI UV products exceed ground-based UV measurements by more than 20%. The comparison between OMI and Brewer EDRs at local noon showed a positive bias, larger in case of all sky conditions (33%) than in cloudless conditions (28%). Concerning YES radiometer EDRs, the bias is 30% under all sky conditions and 23% for clear sky days; a small reduction in the bias can be observed taking into account EDD data from YES radiometer (23% and 21% for all sky and clear sky days, respectively).

This discrepancy may be partly attributed to the fact that the satellite instrument does not effectively probe the extinction by the aerosols which can be important in the boundary layer, mainly in an urban site as Rome. It was observed that the correlation between the relative difference between ground-based and OMI EDRs and AOD at 320.1 nm taking into account data at SZA larger than 55° is moderate ($r=0.44$ for Brewer) or large ($r=0.57$ for YES radiometer).

The difference between OMI and ground-based instruments could also be due to the different atmospheric conditions between solar noon and overpass time. In this regard, the magnitude of changes in atmospheric transmittance was estimated to be -4% with a variability larger than 50%. In addition, the OMI spatial resolution (the distance pixel centre-GB station ranging from 1.7 to 61.6 km) may be insufficient to fully characterize the urban area of Rome.

Further investigations on satellite-derived OMI spectral UV data are required to give hints about the possible sources of uncertainty. Furthermore, EDRs at actual satellite overpass time will be compared with ground-based measurements, in order to decrease the uncertainty of satellite UV retrievals. Finally, the role of absorbing aerosols on OMI UV estimates is under investigation by means of the absorbing aerosol optical

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



depth retrievals derived from Brewer UV irradiances and radiative transfer modelling."

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, 2381, 2008.

ACPD

8, S2140–S2149, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S2149

