We greatly appreciate the referee's comments on our manuscript entitled "Tropospheric photooxidation of CF<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CHO and CF<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CHO initiated by CI atoms and OH radicals", by M. Antiñolo, E. Jiménez, A. Notario, E. Martínez, and J. Albaladejo.

## 1) Comment on the possible CI atom regeneration

As stated on Page 24792 of the manuscript the CI decay profiles were observed to be biexponential after photolysis of  $Cl_2$ /aldehyde mixtures. Similarly to other CI-reactions where  $Cl_2$  was used as a CI photochemical precursor, the chlorine atom regeneration could be explained by the reaction of  $CF_3(CH_2)_xCO$  radicals with  $Cl_2$ :

$$CF_{3}(CH_{2})_{x}CO + CI_{2} \rightarrow CF_{3}(CH_{2})_{x}COCI + CI$$
(14)

After adding  $O_2$  as a radical scavenger, the CI decay profiles became monoexponential, indicating the predominance of reaction (15) versus reaction (14):

$$CF_3(CH_2)_xCO + O_2 \rightarrow CF_3(CH_2)_xC(O)O_2$$
(15)

As stated on Page 24792 of the manuscript no kinetic data on the reactions (14) and (15) are available in the bibliography. Therefore in this work the kinetic behaviour of  $CF_3(CH_2)_xCO$  radicals was assumed to be similar to that of  $CF_3CO$  radicals (smallest fluorinated radical of the series, x = 0) rather than  $CH_3CO$  radicals used by the reviewer. in this way, the deactivating effect  $CF_3$  group is included in the estimation. Of course, the effect of the methylene groups (when x = 1 and 2) on  $k_{(CF_3(CH_2)_xCO + O_2)}$  and  $k_{(CF_3(CH_2)_xCO + CI_2)}$  is not known, but it would be expected an increase in both rate coefficients. Again, the magnitude of such an increment is not known.

 $\begin{array}{lll} {\rm CF_3CO+Cl_2} \rightarrow {\rm CF_3COCl+Cl} & 6,1\times10^{-13}\ {\rm cm^3\ molecule^{-1}\ s^{-1}\ (Maricq\ et\ al.,\ 1995)}\\ {\rm CF_3CO+O_2} \rightarrow {\rm CF_3C(O)O_2} & 7,3\times10^{-13}\ {\rm cm^3\ molecule^{-1}\ s^{-1}\ (Wallington\ et\ al.,\ 1994)}\\ {\rm Thus,\ as\ an\ approach\ we\ assumed\ k_{({\rm CF_3(CH_2)_XCO+O_2})}\ /\ k_{({\rm CF_3(CH_2)_XCO+Cl_2})}\ =\ k_{({\rm CF_3CO+O_2})}/k_{({\rm CF_3CO+O_2})}/k_{({\rm CF_3CO+Cl_2})}\ =\ k_{({\rm CF_3CO+O_2})}/k_{({\rm CF_3CO+Cl_2})}\ =\ 1.2. \ The\ worst\ scenario\ corresponds\ to\ a\ low\ O_2\ concentration\ and\ high\ Cl_2\ concentration,\ what\ is\ presented\ on\ Page\ 24792\ of\ the\ discussion\ paper\ ([O_2]_0/\ [Cl_2]_0\ =\ 50. \ However,\ the\ highest\ [O_2]_0/\ [Cl_2]_0\ ratio\ employed\ was\ up\ to\ ca.\ 70.\ Considering\ these\ concentration\ ratios\ and\ k_{({\rm CF_3(CH_2)_XCO+O_2})}\ /\ k_{({\rm CF_3(CH_2)_XCO+Cl_2})}\ /\ k_{({\rm CF_3(CH_2)_XCO+Cl_2})},\ the\ rate$ 

ratio  $k_{(CF_3(CH_2)_xCO + O_2)}[O_2] / k_{(CF_3(CH_2)_xCO + CI_2)}[CI_2]$  would range from 60 to 84. In other words, about 98% of  $CF_3(CH_2)_xCO$  would react with  $O_2$  and only 2% of those radicals would regenerate CI atoms. Further, and as can be seen in Figure A, CI temporal profiles (in log scale) are linear over usually two lifetimes, indicating that the CI regeneration has been minimized as in other previous works. Therefore, CI-regeneration can be considered negligible under our experimental conditions.



Figure A. Decay temporal profile of RF signal of chlorine atoms recorded at 100 Torr and 331 K for  $CF_3CH_2CHO$  and 351 K for  $CF_3CH_2CH_2CHO$ .

As suggested by Referee #1, some examples of the CI temporal profiles could be included in the revised manuscript or in the supplementary information.

### Effect of temperature in the possible CI-regeneration

Referee #1 suggests that CI atoms could regenerate faster at high temperatures if the activation energies of the reaction of CH<sub>3</sub>CO radicals with O<sub>2</sub> ( $E_a = 0$ ) and Cl<sub>2</sub> ( $E_a/R = 47$  K, Tyndall et al. (1997)) are taken into account. The reaction of CH<sub>3</sub>CO with Cl<sub>2</sub> was studied at temperatures below 298 K (298-228 K). If we extrapolate those results at T > 298 K, the rate coefficient  $k_{(CH_3CO + Cl_2)}$  at the highest temperature (T = 371 K) is 2.47 x 10<sup>-11</sup> cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, implying an increase of 0.3% in the possible CI regeneration. So, under these "speculative" conditions, the CI regeneration would be within the experimental uncertainties.

Again, the magnitude of the effect of temperature on  $k_{(CF_3(CH_2)_xCO + O_2)}$  and  $k_{(CF_3(CH_2)_xCO + Cl_2)}$  is not known and further studies on these reactions at 298 K and above would be helpful. However, the experimental decay profiles obtained for CI atoms at high temperatures (see Figure A) show that there is no appreciable CI-regeneration.

## Effect of addition of different O<sub>2</sub> concentrations

The following statement on Page 24792 of the discussion paper is not precise enough and it will be changed in the revised manuscript: "A few experiments were performed with  $[O_2] \sim 2 \times 10^{16}$  molecule cm<sup>-3</sup> for a limited range of aldehyde concentrations, and the obtained rate coefficients were similar to those obtained with  $[O_2] \sim 1 \times 10^{16}$  molecule cm<sup>-3</sup>". Despite the reduction of the signal-to-noise ratio, the initial  $[O_2]$  was set between 1.0 and  $2.5 \times 10^{16}$  molecule cm<sup>-3</sup> over the T-range studied in order to ensure the minimization of Cl atom regeneration. For example, in Table A the values of  $k_{Cl}$  at room temperature and at different pressures, were listed together with the initial  $O_2$  concentration used in the experiments. Likewise, no difference on  $k_{Cl}$ outside the error limits was observed at 298 K and other temperatures, as observed in Table B.

[O <sub>2</sub> ] ×10 <sup>-16</sup> / molecule cm <sup>-3</sup>	( <i>k</i> <sub>Cl+</sub> ±2σ) ×10 <sup>11</sup> / cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	[O <sub>2</sub> ] ×10 <sup>-16</sup> / molecule cm <sup>-3</sup>	( <i>k</i> <sub>Cl</sub> ±2σ) ×10 <sup>11</sup> / cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	
CF <sub>3</sub> CH <sub>2</sub> CHO		CF <sub>3</sub> CH <sub>2</sub> CH <sub>2</sub> CHO		
1.6	1.52±0.07	1.5	3.34±0.19	
1.7	1.53±0.06	1.7	3.41±0.79	
1.9	1.60±0.06	1.9	3.24±0.53	
2.1	1.48±0.06	2.2	4.00±0.22	
	[O <sub>2</sub> ] ×10 <sup>-16</sup> / molecule cm <sup>-3</sup> CF <sub>3</sub> 1.6 1.7 1.9 2.1	$[O_2] \times 10^{-16/}$ molecule cm <sup>-3</sup> $(k_{Cl+}\pm 2\sigma) \times 10^{11/}$ cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> CF <sub>3</sub> CH <sub>2</sub> CHO1.61.52±0.071.71.53±0.061.91.60±0.062.11.48±0.06	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline [O_2] \times 10^{-16} / & (k_{Cl+} \pm 2\sigma) \times 10^{11} / \ cm^3 & [O_2] \times 10^{-16} / \\ \hline molecule \ cm^{-3} & molecule^{-1} \ s^{-1} & molecule \ cm^{-3} \\ \hline CF_3 CH_2 CHO & CF_3 CH \\ \hline 1.6 & 1.52 \pm 0.07 & 1.5 \\ \hline 1.7 & 1.53 \pm 0.06 & 1.7 \\ \hline 1.9 & 1.60 \pm 0.06 & 1.9 \\ \hline 2.1 & 1.48 \pm 0.06 & 2.2 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	

Table A. Rate coefficients  $k_{Cl}$  for CF<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CHO and CF<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CHO at 298 K and as a function of total pressure.

<b>T</b> / K	[Cl <sub>2</sub> ]×10 <sup>-14</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	[CI] <sub>0</sub> ×10 <sup>-11</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	[RCHO]×10 <sup>-13</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	[O₂]×10 <sup>-16</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	( <i>k</i> <sub>Cl</sub> ±2σ)×10 <sup>11</sup> / cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹
268	3.7	4.3	0.92-8.0	1.7-2.5	1.37±0.10
278	3.2	4.6	0.80-7.5	1.8-1.9	1.42±0.10
288	2.9	4.0	0.79-7.7	1.6-1.9	1.38±0.11
298	3.2	4.5	0.39-15	1.5-2.2	1.55±0.22
316	2.5	3.8	1.8-17	1.3-1.5	1.67±0.38
331	2.4	3.6	1.6-15	1.5-1.2	1.75±0.32
351	2.2	3.4	1.8-12	1.3-1.1	1.80±0.36
371	2.2	3.4	1.4-13	1.0-1.7	1.84±0.15

Table B. Rate coefficients  $k_{CI}$  for CF<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CHO as a function of temperature.

Table C. Rate coefficients  $k_{Cl}$  for CF<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CHO as a function of temperature.

Τ/Κ	[Cl <sub>2</sub> ]×10 <sup>-14</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	[Cl] <sub>0</sub> ×10 <sup>-11</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	[RCHO]×10 <sup>-13</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	[O <sub>2</sub> ]×10 <sup>-16</sup> / cm <sup>-3</sup>	( <i>k</i> <sub>Cl</sub> ±2σ)×10 <sup>11</sup> / cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>
268	3.1	3.8	1.3-11	1.6-2.2	2.85±0.45
278	2.9	3.6	1.5-13	1.6-1.8	2.98±0.20
288	2.7	3.7	1.3-11	1.5-1.9	3.20±0.14
298	3.0	4.1	0.75-21	1.4-2.2	3.39±0.70
316	2.4	3.6	1.2-11	1.3-1.5	4.05±0.46
331	2.3	3.3	1.2-10	1.3	4.60±0.24
351	2.3	2.8	1.3-11	1.2-2.3	4.79±0.74
371	2.1	2.6	1.2-10	1.0-1.4	5.13±0.41

#### 2) Minor Comments

We agree with the reviewer that the statement on Page 24875 of the paper under discussion is too broad. The global warming potentials of HFCs range from 53 (HFC-152,  $\tau = 0.6$  yr) to 14,760 (HFC-23,  $\tau = 270$  yr) over an integration time horizon of 100 years (WMO, 2006). Generally, the higher the atmospheric lifetime for a HFC is, the higher its GWP will be. Of course, the radiative efficiency (W m<sup>-2</sup> ppbv<sup>-1</sup>) of HFCs is a determining factor in GWP (as it can be seen in Table D).

Thus, the statement on Page 24875 of the discussion paper will be changed by "Moreover, both of them (referring to HCFCs and HFCs) are in general very strong greenhouse gases with high Global Warming Potentials (GWP) commonly associated with long tropospheric lifetimes and strong absorption in the IR region".

Table D.	
----------	--

Radiative efficiency	tau	GWP (100-yr)
0.19	270	14,760
0.11	4.9	675
0.02	2.4	92
0.23	29	3,500
0.18	9.6	1,100
0.16	14	1,430
0.13	3.5	353
0.13	52	4,470
0.09	0.6	53
0.09	1.4	124
0.26	34.2	3,220
0.23	13.6	1,340
0.3	10.7	1,370
0.28	240	9,810
0.23	6.2	693
0.28	7.6	1,030
0.21	8.6	794
0.4	15.9	1,640
	Radiative efficiency         0.19         0.11         0.02         0.23         0.18         0.16         0.13         0.13         0.09         0.26         0.23         0.3         0.28         0.23         0.24	Radiative efficiency         tau           0.19         270           0.11         4.9           0.02         2.4           0.23         29           0.18         9.6           0.16         14           0.13         3.5           0.13         52           0.09         0.6           0.09         1.4           0.23         34.2           0.23         13.6           0.3         10.7           0.28         240           0.23         6.2           0.24         7.6           0.21         8.6           0.4         15.9

# Section 3.3. Impact of fluoroaldehyde chemistry on air quality

We agree with Referee#1 that the atmospheric abundance of fluorinated aldehydes is currently low. However, the possible widespread use of fluorinated alcohols as subsitutes of HFCs will inevitably lead to an increase in fluoroaldehyde concentrations, since they are the major oxidation products. Thus, further studies on the degradation products of their homogeneous oxidation and UV photodissociation will be needed in order to evaluate the environmental impact of these fluoroaldehydes. So, the statement on Page 24798 is changed by:

"As the major degradation routes are reactions with OH radicals and UV photolysis, products of such processes should be known in order to evaluate the influence on the air quality".