

## ***Interactive comment on “Impact of Chinese SO<sub>2</sub> emissions on submicron aerosol concentration at Mt. Tateyama, Japan” by K. Osada et al.***

**W. Porch (Referee)**

wporch@lanl.gov

Received and published: 17 August 2009

This is an excellent paper describing trends over a ten year period of sub-micron aerosol concentrations at a site on a mountain in Japan and interpretations using meteorological and chemical modeling. The most surprising result is the relative lack of significant trends in nighttime aerosol observations during the summer and autumn when aerosol concentrations were the highest (Fig 4). This would seem to dampen recent speculation regarding a rise in global background aerosol (global dimming). The observed increasing trends in winter are very interesting and deserve more discussion and analysis. The authors state that the models predict that the influence of Chinese SO<sub>2</sub> to sulfate emissions are high (60 to 80%) in winter-spring and low (20 to 80%) in other seasons. This statement deserves more discussion. The implica-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

tion is that this is a wind direction effect, but this seems to conflict with the statement that “During the winter monsoon period (November–April), strong northwesterly winds prevailed with frequent snowfalls with rimed ice.” The lack of trend in rainfall in Fig. 5 is interesting, but much more discussion is required to understand the possible effect of meteorological parameters. For instance, snowfall trends may be different than rainfall trends. Also, boundary layer trends derived from atmospheric temperature profiles may be important. Since the sampling site is at 2450 m a.s.l. trends (or lack thereof) in the strength and depth of mixing both over the source regions of China and at the receptor need more discussion. It is also possible that daytime ground heating in China can mix the SO<sub>2</sub> above the nighttime inversion and the nighttime inversion can act as a smooth lower boundary so that the particles can more easily flow directly to the sampling site. These effects may (or may not be) included in the modeling, but more discussion is required. I include a few minor editorial comments: 1.pg 16529 (last paragraph) “. . .increasing trend in aerosol data.” to “. . .increasing trend in aerosol concentrations.” 2.pg 16532 (1st paragraph) the summer eruption of the Miyakejima Volcano is mentioned but hard to see effect in (Fig. 2) maybe an arrow could be included in figure. 3.pg 16535 (2nd paragraph) the reference to Fig. 7 needs to be read very carefully to separate which data are observed (I think the red) and which are simulated results (I think blue). It would help if this were clarified in the text and included in the figure caption.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, 16527, 2009.

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