

***Interactive comment on “Can a global model
chemical mechanism reproduce NO,
NO₂, and O₃
measurements above a tropical rainforest?” by
R. C. Pike et al.***

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 5 February 2010

Pike et al. report their global and box model studies about the observations of NO, NO₂, and O₃ in a high isoprene and low NO_x condition which is of growing importance as highlighted by the works from Lelieveld et al., (2008), Ren et al., (2008) and Hofzumahaus et al., (2009). The major scientific question answered by this paper is "What are the dominant uncertainty sources of the global model for the simulations of NO_x and O₃: chemical mechanism or the atmospheric dynamics?" This is indeed a very interesting issue which needs to be explored. In case of the air quality models, when they under-perform, problems are usually attributed to emissions (including their

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



quantity and the speciation of organic compounds); to meteorology and to sub-grid scale effects. While in many cases, the atmospheric chemical mechanisms are not questioned.

In this manuscript, the discussion is initiated by the discrepancies between the modeled and measured O₃ concentrations; then a question is naturally raised up as "why the model can reproduce the daytime NO_x concentration but not O₃?" ; afterwards a number of sensitivity studies on the chemical mechanism modifications with a box model, however none of these chemical improvements are able to improve the simulation results; furthermore, the physics parameter adjustments (venting parameter and boundary layer height) are tried and finally can reach a reasonable O₃ simulation results. From that point of view, the authors conclude that the major uncertainty source should be come from the physical parameters setup (boundary height) in the global model. This is a interesting story and materials are good which is valuable to be published by ACP. However, I have some considerations especially on the chemical part which needs to be addressed before publication.

Let's think about the NO budget:

$$\frac{d[\text{NO}]}{dt} = j\text{NO}_2 \times [\text{NO}_2] - k[\text{NO}][\text{O}_3] - k'[\text{NO}][\text{ROx}] + E - k''[\text{NO}][\text{XO}] \quad (1)$$

Normally NO would reach steady state ($d[\text{NO}]/dt=0$) during daytime, the observed day-time concentration profile of NO also provide clues on that. Thus we can rearrange equation (1) to be:

$$\frac{[\text{NO}_2]}{[\text{NO}]} = \frac{k[\text{O}_3] + k'[\text{ROx}] + k''[\text{XO}] - E / [\text{NO}]}{j\text{NO}_2} \quad (2)$$


For the environment the authors are discussed, I think the emission term of NO (as denoted by E in these two equations) could be neglected.

C10539

According to Fig. 3, actually I see very nice match between both global model runs with the measurements of NO and NO₂, this means that in the model the [NO₂]/[NO] ratio is correctly reproduced. At this step if you want to improve the O₃ simulation without degrade that of the NO_x, you should check if your model have correctly simulated jNO₂, RO_x and possibly there are some unknown oxidations of NO (denoted by XO in these two above equations) which has not been incorporated into all the current chemical mechanism (In your conditions, the halogen chemistry might be a candidate for this extra oxidation). The later two factors are obviously point to the problems of the chemical mechanism. Detailed comments or suggestions about how to check jNO₂ and RO_x issues are given by specific comments 2, 5 and 6 et al.

Specific Comments

1. Page 27616 line 9 The text describe the site is 426m high. However, later on the box model use 1013mbar which seems to be not suitable.
2. Page 27620 line 7 The text mentioned that the MIM is used, that is good, but could be better if you can try the proposed generic reaction mechanism proposed by Kubistin et al., (2009) and Hofzumahaus et al., (2009):



since these two reactions could probably improve the RO_x simulation results and thus help the O₃ simulation. Besides, halogen chemical mechanism is also valuable to try. Nevertheless, this comment is only for the authors consideration. The major point is that I would like to see some argument about the quality and uncertainties of the RO_x simulation. There were already relatively detailed discussions have been provided by a companion paper-Pugh et al.(2010) and probably

more detailed discussions would be given further by Whalley et al.(in preparation). Nevertheless, either a relatively detailed discussions about the RO_x radical simulation should be included in this paper or the author should provide reasonable arguments that the uncertainty of the RO_x simulation is not critical for the O₃ simulation herein.

Besides, only isoprene emissions has been considered by both the global and the box model, while terpene emissions could be of significance for forest region as well. Especially, some terpene chemistry has been discussed by Pugh et al.(2010). Therefore, it would be useful to account terpene chemistry in this case. And hopefully RO_x radical concentration would grow up and the O₃ concentration may drop down then in the model system.

P27620 line 21: "Emissions of NO_x, CO, ethane, propane and isoprene are included." Emissions of monoterpenes are not mentioned. The typical monoterpene to isoprene ration was between 0.2-0.25 at the Bukit Atur GAW station (Hewitt et al., 2010). Please clarify this as well.

3. P27621 line 26 Please give a brief description of vertical structure configuration of p-TOMCAT model. Are the modeled concentrations of O₃ and NO_x in surface layer compared with ground observations?
4. Page 27620 line 27 It would be useful to present how are the diurnal profiles of the isoprene emissions look like since there are no reference given. (May be given as supplementary materials). The detailed number of the dry deposition velocity of NO_x, O₃ and HCHO etc would be valuable to be presented for the reader to evaluate as well.
5. Page 27622 line 19, the rate constant for jNO₂ was reduced by 50% to account for clouds and aerosol. What is the detailed reason to reduce jNO₂ down by 50%? Obviously, two different mechanisms are used to generate jNO₂ in the box model and the global model. One is MCM approximations and the others are Cambridge

- 2-D model. It would be valuable to present the diurnal variations of jNO_2 along with the NO_x and O_3 since that are critical for the reader to understand what was going on. Besides, according to Table 1 of Hewitt et al. (2010), there were in-situ photolysis frequency measurements in BA site, thus it would be valuable to perform intercomparisons of the calculated and measured jNO_2 since it is a critical parameter subjected to O_3 simulation.
6. Page 27622, How much are the CH_4 and H_2 concentrations set in your model?. Besides, since the authors had only include NO and Isoprene emissions, which indicate the dominant role of isoprene chemistry in the box model calculations. Could the author compare your calculated isoprene concentration profile with the that of the measurement show by a companion paper (Hewitt et al., 2010). It would be helpful to compare the simulated levels of individual VOCs or even total VOCs by the p-TOMCAT global model or the corresponding box model with observations, which might provide some insights to the deviation of modeled O_3 from the observed.
7. Page 27623 line 27 The authors stated:"A dilution parameter was introduced to simulate mixing with the free troposphere resulting from a collapse of the boundary layer at night. This \hat{A}_v venting parameter $\hat{A}_v \pm$ removes..." Could the authors provide a little more details? (i.e. what are the concentrations of NO_x and O_3 you have assumed in the free troposphere?)
8. Page 27630 line 3 The author stated, "Modelled NO_2 is slightly higher than the measured values but captures the structure of the measurements effectively." Actually, this judgement is not true, the modeled NO_2 is about a factor of 2 higher than the corresponding measurement results during 12:00 - 16:00 (Fig.7). In fact, as the author discovered by the cost-function analysis(Fig. 6), the optimization results show that the requirements from NO_2 are very different with that of NO and O_3 which imply that only with adjustment of physical parameters is not enough.

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

Interactive
Comment

9. As can be seen from the daytime concentration profile of O_3 (i.e. from fig. 2), the O_3 concentration profile is very flat. It looks like to be in kind of steady state. The behavior has been captured by both the global model and the final box model. It would then be useful to perform a budget analysis (a figure) to display how much is from transport and how much is from chemical production.
10. P27632 line 5 Based on the sensitivity tests of box model, the authors have reached that the physical parameters (especially those related to boundary layer structure) are important to the accuracy of modeled results. Although we cannot expect the boundary layer scheme of p-TOMCAT can capture the details of the boundary layer structure in the campaign area, the comparison of the diagnosed boundary layer height used in the global model (P27620 line 15) with the local observation-based boundary layer height (if available) would show a direct clue to the discrepancies between modeled results and observations.
11. P27632 line14-15 "The vertical gradient of NO_2 , in both the model and the observations, suggests that transport down from the free troposphere is required to explain the observations." Two questions on this sentence. (1) Fig. 2 shows aircraft data in July, are the measurements aloft also available in April? (2) If based on the data in July, the right figure of Fig. 2 shows that the NO_2 levels in free troposphere aloft are much lower than those in boundary layer, which suggests a transport up to the free troposphere by the vertical gradient of NO_2 . Please clarify this.
12. Rainfall and heavy cloud greatly decrease the role of photochemical process on the evolution of O_3 and NO_x . How often wet precipitation happened during the April? Do the diurnal cycles of measured O_3 and NO_x include the data during rainfall or only those in dry period?

Technical comments

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

1. P27642 Fig. 1: The data points are too dense, and it is not easy to distinguish the black dots and black line. A running average of half hour or one hour for smoothing is enough for the time interval used in later analysis. It will be clearer to use different colors to illustrate data dots and data lines.

Reference

Hewitt, C. N., Lee, J. D., MacKenzie, A. R., Barkley, M. P., Carslaw, N., Carver, G. D., Chappell, N. A., Coe, H., Collier, C., Commane, R., Davies, F., Davison, B., DiCarlo, P., Di Marco, C. F., Dorsey, J. R., Edwards, P. M., Evans, M. J., Fowler, D., Furneaux, K. L., Gallagher, M., Guenther, A., Heard, D. E., Helfter, C., Hopkins, J., Ingham, T., Irwin, M., Jones, C., Karunaharan, A., Langford, B., Lewis, A. C., Lim, S. F., MacDonald, S. M., Mahajan, A. S., Malpass, S., McFiggans, G., Mills, G., Misztal, P., Moller, S., Monks, P. S., Nemitz, E., Nicolas-Perea, V., Oetjen, H., Oram, D. E., Palmer, P. I., Phillips, G. J., Pike, R., Plane, J. M. C., Pugh, T., Pyle, J. A., Reeves, C. E., Robinson, N. H., Stewart, D., Stone, D., Whalley, L. K., and Yin, X.: Overview: Oxidant and particle photochemical processes above a south-east asian tropical rainforest (the op3 project): Introduction, rationale, location characteristics and tools, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 169-199.

Hofzumahaus, A., F. Rohrer, K. D. Lu, B. Bohn, T. Brauers, C. C. Chang, H. Fuchs, F. Holland, K. Kita, Y. Kondo, X. Li, S. R. Lou, M. Shao, L. M. Zeng, A. Wahner and Y. H. Zhang (2009). "Amplified Trace Gas Removal in the Troposphere." Science 324(5935): 1702-1704.

Kubistin, D., H. Harder, M. Martinez, M. Rudolf, R. Sander, H. Bozem, G. Eerdeken, H. Fischer, C. Gurk, T. K₁pfel, R. K₂unigstedt, U. Parchatka, C. L. Schiller, A. Stickler, D. Taraborrelli, J. Williams and J. Lelieveld (2008). "Hydroxyl radicals
C10544

in the tropical troposphere over the Suriname rainforest: comparison of measurements with the box model MECCA." Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss. 8(4): 15239-15289.

Lelieveld, J., T. M. Butler, J. N. Crowley, T. J. Dillon, H. Fischer, L. Ganzeveld, H. Harder, M. G. Lawrence, M. Martinez, D. Taraborrelli and J. Williams (2008). "Atmospheric oxidation capacity sustained by a tropical forest." Nature 452(7188): 737-740.

Pugh, T. A. M., MacKenzie, A. R., Hewitt, C. N., Langford, B., Edwards, P. M., Furneaux, K. L., Heard, D. E., Hopkins, J. R., Jones, C. E., Karunaharan, A., Lee, J., Mills, G., Misztal, P., Moller, S., Monks, P. S., and Whalley, L. K.: Simulating atmospheric composition over a south-east asian tropical rainforest: Performance of a chemistry box model, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 279-298.

Whalley, L. K., Furneaux, K. L., Goddard, A., Lee, J. D., Mahajan, A., Oetjen, H., Read, K. A., Carpenter, L. J., Lewis, A. C., Plane, J. M. C., Saltzman, E. S., and Heard, D. E.: The Chemistry of OH and HO₂ in the Boundary Layer over the tropical Atlantic Ocean, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., in preparation, 2009.

Ren, X. R., J. R. Olson, J. H. Crawford, W. H. Brune, J. Q. Mao, R. B. Long, Z. Chen, G. Chen, M. A. Avery, G. W. Sachse, J. D. Barrick, G. S. Diskin, L. G. Huey, A. Fried, R. C. Cohen, B. Heikes, P. O. Wennberg, H. B. Singh, D. R. Blake and R. E. Shetter (2008). "HO_x chemistry during INTEX-A 2004: Observation, model calculation, and comparison with previous studies." Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres 113(D5): -.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

