

***Interactive comment on “Midlatitude stratosphere – troposphere exchange as diagnosed by MLS O<sub>3</sub> and MOPITT CO assimilated fields” by L. El Amraoui et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 16 November 2009

**General comments:**

This manuscript presents a case study of chemical data assimilation application using a stratospheric intrusion event. Analyses presented focus on the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere (UT/LS) ozone and CO fields from MOCAGE CTM with and without satellite data assimilation. The results show that chemical data assimilation significantly improves the model's ability to represent the dynamical variability of chemical tracer fields in the UT/LS region. The potential of MLS ozone and MOPITT CO data assimilation for STE studies is discussed in the conclusion.

The manuscript is well organized and clearly written. The results are interesting and

C7161

made a very good case for integrating models and satellite observations. There are several weaknesses in the manuscript. The analysis presented are not consistently quantitative in all cases and can be easily improved. The interpretation of the resulting ozone and CO fields has some ambiguity and needs clarification. The final discussion on the implication of this work to STE studies can also be strengthened. In particular the two assimilated tracers are discussed largely in an isolated fashion, while this pair of tracers is known to work well together in STE studies. Specific suggestions are given below for the authors' consideration.

**Specific comments**

1. The main conclusion of the paper, a significant improvement of UT/LS tracer representation after integrating satellite data and CTM, will be better supported if the improvements are quantified. An example is figure 6. In this case, ozone total column from the free CTM and the data assimilation run are compared with OMI. This figure can be done in the same way as the CO field in fig 10. Visually from fig 6 the free run did not produce enough Ozone and the assimilation run produced too much. The discussion (p20692 para 1) states that the assimilated field and OMI “are nearly the same in the area of interest”, which is ambiguous. If this is really the case, a three-way comparison of profiles from free run, assimilation run and the ozonesonde measurement (figure 1) will provide a strong quantitative statement.
2. The improvement of CTM with data assimilation can also be shown more quantitatively in the validation comparisons. For example, authors may consider including free running CTM in Figure 5 and figure 8. In figure 9, it would be much more relevant to show the statistical differences between the modeled and observed profiles before and after data assimilation, rather than showing the profile statistics from the model and the observations.
3. In figure 11, the color scale for panels a) c) and b) d) are different. The choice is such that the enhanced ozone variability after satellite data assimilation at the 315 K

C7162

level is visually significant in panel c) but not at all visible in panel d). Similarly, Figure 13 a) can choose the color scale differently to show the relevant ozone gradient in the tropopause region. The statement of “under-estimate” (page 20695) would be much better supported if the 3-way profile comparison is made.

4. In the final discussion, the authors emphasize the effectiveness of CO assimilation in providing the stratospheric signature, compensating the under representation of ozone in the intrusion. Since the motivation of representing stratospheric intrusion in the model is largely about its impact on tropospheric ozone budget, the “weaker” result in ozone assimilation and the “stronger” result in CO assimilation lead to an ambiguity of how much the model’s applicability in STE studies is improved. In addition to the previous suggestions of quantifying ozone change after assimilation, it is worth considering the opportunity here to examine the O3-CO correlation with and without assimilation. If the use of MOPPITT CO indeed adds more information to CTM for the UT chemical tracer field, more effectively than using the MLS ozone field alone, this may be quantified by looking at the changes in tracer correlations. A significant number of studies using aircraft data have documented the statistical features of the tracer relationship and can be taken advantages here (e.g. Pan et al., 2007; Strahan et al., 2007). This additional analysis should strengthen the conclusion of this work.

#### Minor comments

- Labels in several figures are too small. In particular, labels in figure 3 must be enlarged. Figs. 6 and 10 can use larger font size too.

- “modelled” -> “modeled” ?

#### References

Pan, L. L., J. C. Wei, D. E. Kinnison, R. R. Garcia, D. J. Wuebbles, and G. P. Brasseur (2007), A set of diagnostics for evaluating chemistry-climate models in the extratropical tropopause region, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D09316, doi:10.1029/2006JD007792

C7163

Strahan, S. E., Duncan, B. N., and Hoor, P.: Observationally derived transport diagnostics for the lowermost stratosphere and their application to the GMI chemistry and transport model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 2435-2445, 2007.

---

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 9, 20677, 2009.

C7164