

Interactive comment on “An evaluation of the impact of aerosol particles on weather forecasts from a biomass burning aerosol event over the Midwestern US: Observational-based analysis of surface temperature” by Jianglong Zhang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 1 March 2016

General comments:

This study analyzed a major continental scale biomass burning smoke event to evaluate the degree of surface cooling introduced by the smoke plume, and how this affects model bias in near surface air temperature forecasts. The study found that the smoke aerosol induced surface cooling is comparable to model uncertainties, and thus concluded that incorporating a more realistic aerosol field into numerical model will not significantly improve the accuracy of near surface air temperature forecasts.

The analysis is detailed, and the presentation is clear. However, the limitations of the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



study are not fully addressed and thus the conclusion is over-stated. The length of the paper could also be shortened by making the description of the dataset and the event more concise, so that the reader could get to the key points more quickly.

Major comments:

The study is only focused on cloud free conditions, thus only aerosol direct effect is considered. However, it is well known that aerosols not only affect climate directly through reflecting or absorbing solar radiation, but also indirectly through affecting cloud microphysics in both stratiform and convective clouds. A summary of these effects could be found in Tao et al. (2012). With this effect omitted from the study, it is not justified to conclude that incorporating a more realistic aerosol field into numerical models will not significantly improve forecast accuracy. The limitations of the study should be addressed.

Minor comments:

Line 86-89: “Upscaling aerosol effects from individual weather phenomenon to climate...” The word “upscaling” seems to imply that the result from this study, which focuses on aerosol effect on weather, has implication for studies about aerosol effect on climate. This is misleading since whether the aerosol signal is detectable in weather forecasting does not relate to whether it is detectable in climate simulations. They are based on different time and spacial scales. I suggest to just focus this statement on studies of aerosol effect on weather phenomenon.

Line 173: remove “the” after “a”.

Line 281: remove “at”.

Line 443: “temperate” should be “temperature”.

Line 501: “52-hr” or “54-hr”? Some places are “52-hr”, while others are “54-hr” in the manuscript. It is also “54-hr” on the figure caption. This is confusing.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Line 509: Why does 30-hr forecast has larger error than 52-hr? From line 503, the largest surface temperature bias comes from 52-hr forecast.

Line 515: Should be “Figure A1 and A2”.

Line 515: It seems the 0-hr forecast from NCEP has the largest error from Figure A2. This is different from ECMWF and UKMO, why?

Line 541-545: It is not clear how this translates into the importance of radiative warming/cooling versus thermal advection.

Line 558-559: This sentence need to be re-written.

Reference: Tao, W.-K., J.-P. Chen, Z. Li, C. Wang, and C. Zhang (2012), Impact of aerosols on convective clouds and precipitation, *Rev. Geophys.*, 50, RG2001, doi:10.1029/2011RG000369.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/acp-2015-1003, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)