

Interactive comment on “Net ozone production and its relationship to NO_x and VOCs in the marine boundary layer around the Arabian Peninsula” by Ivan Tadic et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 14 February 2020

Review of “Net ozone production and its relationship to NO_y and VOCs in the marine boundary layer around the Arabian Peninsula” by Tadic et al

The authors have a very interesting data set. I’m not familiar with the chemistry of this region but I assume there are few high quality NO_x measurements and perhaps no radical measurements. Analysis is through the use of deviations from the Leighton photostationary state to get peroxy radical concentrations which are then used in conjunction with measured NO to obtain ozone production rates. Observed OH and HO₂ are presented only via a color-coded ship track. As far as I can tell, the only use of the observed OH and HO₂ is to determine loss rates of ozone which when added to the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



PSS ozone production rate yields a net ozone production rate. The ratio of HCHO to NO_x (both observed quantities) is used as an indicator ratio to predict regions in which O₃ production is either NO_x or VOC sensitive.

Comparisons are made with a Eulerian model for NO_x, ozone, and RO₂ mixing ratios as well as for net O₃ production rate. This article contains the quantum of information to warrant publication. I can only guess that either they want to write up the radical and HCHO measurements in a separate study or that they are uninterruptable for one reason or another.

I found the article difficult to follow in places. It is my belief that the authors have underestimated the uncertainty of the instruments used to determine peroxy radicals. The authors need to re-examine their error propagation formula. I am calling this a major revision as it affects the most prominent results in the paper. In practice it can be done in an afternoon. They could also compare the PSS value of RO₂ with measured HO₂ (which is stated to be preliminary due to an up to 20% interference by RO₂). This is a reality test.

1. line 124 “UV-induced positive bias in the NO₂ measurements due to photolysis of HONO, BrONO₂, NO₃ and ClNO₂ to produce NO was characterized ahead of the campaign to be 7.7 %, 7.2 %, 5.6 % and 1.5 % of the respective ambient concentration of HONO, BrONO₂, NO₃ and ClNO₂ respectively,”

(Italics mine). No where in the paper is it mentioned that these species are measured. Have interferences been determined based on model-calculated or typical concentrations? Or do these figures represent the percent interference if the interferent has the same concentration as NO?

2. line 181 NO₂ was further measured by cavity ring-down spectroscopy (Sobanski et al., 2016) and used for correcting the instrumental background of the CLD NO₂ data, as described above (the correction was taken as the ultimate absolute measurement uncertainty in the CLD NO₂ data).

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

The uncertainty of the NO₂ chemiluminescent measurement is not equal to that of the cavity ring-down instrument. The chemiluminescent NO₂ is the difference between two measurements, one of which gets divided by 0.294 to take into account photolysis efficiency. In order to add errors in quadrature, I need to know the NO to NO₂ ratio. I'm guessing that the relative uncertainty of NO₂ will be at least twice that of NO. The NO₂ chemiluminescent measurement is affected adversely by the relatively low photolysis efficiency. That accounts for random errors in NO₂. Comparison with the cavity ring-down may take care of the NO₂ instrumental background but how does it take care of the random errors?

Line 205 Total Measurement Uncertainty. All of these numbers appear very optimistic. In a previous comment, I gave my reasons why the TMU of NO₂ appeared low. I do not know why the TMU of HO₂ is not larger than OH. There are many sources of uncertainty in the conversion of HO₂ to OH which is the quantity actually measured. The authors state a 20% bias due to RO₂ chemistry. I do not know to what extent quantification of HO₂ is made easier than that of OH because there is more HO₂ than OH and hence a larger signal.

3. Line 272 "In low NO_x environments (< 100 pptv) previous studies have indicated that further NO oxidizing trace gases such as peroxy radicals (HO₂, RO₂) and halogen monoxides (XO) may result in a deviation from unity (Nakamura et al., 2003; Hosaynali Beygi et al., 2011; Reed et al., 2016)."

Deviations from the Leighton relation can also be important at higher NO. Departures of the Leighton ratio from unity depend (primarily) on the competition between HO₂+NO and O₃+NO. In polluted environments, HO₂ concentrations can increase, remain steady, or decrease only slowly as NO is increased.

Line 250 and following. Does Fig. S1 show the ratio of actinic flux in the 4 hour window centered around noon to the total measured actinic flux? Or is Fig. S1 a ratio obtained by fitting a Gaussian, between zeroes in the AM and PM?

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

4. Lines 266-270, typos for O singlet D. Elsewhere, the “1” is in its proper place as a superscript.

5. Line 285. Am I correct that insofar as ozone production is concerned the only use of the HO₂ and OH measurements is their contribution to the loss rate of ozone (and hence their effect on net ozone production)?

6. Line 373. “We find that the median NO_x(model)/NO_x(measurement)-ratio throughout the whole campaign is 0.91, indicating that the model underestimates NO_x by roughly 10 %.”

The median of what? Could you please specify what items you are taking the median of; i.e., what are the data points. Ratios by Region? Days? Individual data points. I may have missed it; how long are data points? Equal to the 5 minute instrument averaging time?

7. Line 391. “Noontime RO₂ was estimated based on Eq. 3. As the steady state assumption will not hold for air masses originating from fresh emissions (times to acquire steady state estimated from the inverse sum of the loss and production terms for NO₂ typically ranged from 1-2 minutes during AQABA) and for fast changes in the actinic flux,”

What I think you want to say is mis-stated. As written, it says: We can't use samples that had fresh emissions, so we used samples taken when actinic flux was slowly changing. Was the data screened to eliminate time periods in which NO_x (or less likely O₃) was rapidly varying? From the looks of the actinic flux plot you did not have many clouds giving rapid variations in jNO₂. I would be surprised if the time window around noon could not have been wider. How much does jNO₂ change between, say noon-3 hours and noon – 175 minutes and what change in HO₂ does that produce?

8. Figure 6. Obtaining peroxy radical concentrations from photostationary state calculations is not easy.

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

Line 413 “the total uncertainty in the RO₂ estimates is estimated at 14%. This is a way too optimistic estimate of the uncertainty of RO₂. Instrument precision is too high and no account (except for NO₂) is taken of biases. Even still, the PSS is a difference in two numbers, often of comparable magnitude. I’m not certain the error propagation was correctly performed. I would like to see the formula that represents “errors added in quadrature”. Compare those results with a simple Monte Carlo calculation that can be done on a spreadsheet. And keep in mind that the result will not take into account errors in rate constants.

9. Line 416. “Negative values for all regions are regularly found in the vicinity of fresh emissions and air masses not in photochemical equilibrium”

That might be the explanation. It would be useful to quantify this point. HO₂ and RO₂ concentrations will be low in a high NO_x environment. The negative values may reflect the measurement accuracy needed to distinguish, for example, – 5 ppt RO₂ from zero.

10. Figure 7. Here the RO₂ data looks much better. There are differences mentioned in the text. but for this reader could you please provide a concise reason why Fig. 7. looks so much better than Fig. 6. Is it the data groupings? I assume that in both Fig. 6 and 7. the blue RO₂ data is from Eq. 3. I am not totally positive because you were measuring HO₂ and some fraction of RO₂.

11. Line 421. As peroxy radicals are short-lived molecules generated from the oxidation of VOCs, enhanced RO₂ concentrations observed over the Arabian Gulf are most likely due to high VOC observed over the Arabian Gulf are most likely due to high VOC emissions from intense oil and gas activities in the region.

High HO₂ can also occur in aged air masses in which NO_x and VOCs have reacted away but still have significant O₃ and (perhaps) HCHO. Photolysis could then yield peroxy radicals.

12. Line 440. Regarding the extrapolated actinic flux curve to get a daily ozone pro-

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

duction. $j(\text{IOD})$ decreases early and late in the day faster than $J(\text{NO}_2)$. Not sure how much difference it makes. I would be very leery of this extrapolation over land; I'm assuming that you are far enough away that varying traffic and boundary layer heights are not a concern.

13. Line 455 "the uncertainty of the regional NOPR is 40 % which has been estimated by error propagation"

I don't disagree with this value. Merely surprised at its magnitude compared to a 15% uncertainty for RO_2 from Eq. 3. . 14. Line 473. "Although EMAC predicts high ozone levels over the Arabian Sea, it also reports the lowest NOPR in this region. Deviations between model-calculated estimate and the estimate based on measured tracer data over the Mediterranean and over the Southern Red Sea could be linked to NO_x being overestimated in the model in these regions."

I'm not following. There is a low net ozone production rate. which to me implies that the model has a too low NO concentration, but you say that the model overpredicts NO_x .

15. Section 3.4 VOC and NO_x sensitivity. Makes sense.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-1031>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

