

Reply to Referee #1

Thank you for carefully reading the manuscript and providing useful suggestions to improve the paper. The replies to your comments are given below.

Major Comments 1. Please add the comments about background depolarization ratio at the observation site. The authors mentioned about the effect of dust and biomass particles. And there is no effect by dust and/or biomass particles during study period by satellite data etc. But, there are any explanation about background data except pollen period. Please add depolarization ratio value in normal day (No pollen, dust and biomass particle).

To check the background aerosol at our measurement site, lidar measurements during different times of the year have been checked. The particle depolarization ratio of the ground-near aerosol layer during the winter months of 2015 and 2016 are shown in Fig.1a. The winter time was selected to ensure the absence of pollen. Backward trajectories have been checked and measurements with distinct aerosol layers were omitted. The mean PDR during normal days without influence of pollen or other depolarizing aerosols is $4\pm 1\%$, which is smaller than during the pollen-influenced period. Also pollen-free periods during spring and summer time, which means no pollen have been counted by the Hirst-type pollen collector, have been checked and are shown in Fig1 b, c. The mean values of PDR during those periods was $3.5\pm 1\%$ in March/May and $3.9\pm 1\%$ in July/August. However, during spring and summer the absence of pollen in the atmosphere cannot be confirmed with absolute certainty even if there are no pollen collected by the Hirst-type sampler.

As the depolarization ratio of cases without detected pollen on ground-level or other depolarizing aerosol is below 4% and therefore significantly lower than during the presented pollination period, the particle depolarization ratio can be used to detect the presence of pollen in the atmosphere.

Information about background aerosol was added in section 4.2., as:

“However the effect of the background particles has to be considered. Lidar measurements during the winter months of 2015 and 2016 and during pollen-free periods in spring and summer 2016 have been analyzed to determine the effect of background aerosol at our measurement site. During winter time the absence of pollen can be ensured, but there is a possibility that pollen also have been present in the atmosphere during spring and summer when no pollen were detected by the Hirst-type sampler on ground. Nevertheless, values of mean PDR at 532 nm are below 4% during all analyzed periods with no observed pollen concentration. Since the PDR during the pollination period is significantly higher than the PDR of the background aerosol, the depolarization ratio can be used as an indicator for detecting the presence of pollen.”




Figure 1 Histograms of mean PDR within the lowest aerosol layer during January 2015 and 2016 (A) and pollen-free cases during March/May 2016 (B) and July/August 2016 (C).

2. Authors separated the layer as shown in Fig. 2. Only the lowest layer (black color) is considered in the study as mentioned in section 3. But, diurnal variation and maximum heights are different between two pollen period in Fig. 1 (c). In addition, the authors explained that the number of pollen grains is higher in the first period (5-9 May), but the degree of polarization extinction is higher in the second periods, which is explained by the high non-sphericity of spruce pollen. However, only explained reason in the paper is not sufficient. Therefore, it seems that data for other weather elements such as atmospheric boundary layer changes in each period should be added.

We checked the meteorological variation during our campaign. Mean values of the diurnal cycle of temperature and relative humidity at our measurement site 2 m above ground, during the first (green) and second (black) period are shown in Fig.2. Green and grey shaded areas indicate the variability during the two periods. The higher pollen concentration during the first period is likely related to the higher temperature and lower relative humidity during this period. In previous studies a correlation between pollen concentration and temperature and relative humidity has been shown. The different mixture of pollen types can be explained by the changing wind direction during the periods (see Fig.3). The most frequent wind direction in this first period was northwest. In the second period the air masses were mainly advected from southeast. The boundary layer height only changes slightly during the selected period and there are no significant differences between the two periods. A paragraph about the meteorological conditions during both periods is added in section 3, as:

“Those variations can be explained by the different meteorological conditions during the two periods. A big difference of the predominant wind direction in the two periods has been observed, which may cause the different mixture of pollen types. The most frequent wind direction in period 1 was northwest, whereas in period 2 the air masses were mainly advected from southeast. When comparing the diurnal cycle of temperature and relative humidity measured at ground level, we found higher temperature values and lower relative humidity in period 1 than period 2. Temperature and pollen concentration have been shown to be positive correlated whereas pollen concentration and relative humidity show a negative correlation (Bartková-Ščevková, 2003). The different pollen concentration could therefore be explained by variations of temperature and humidity.”




Figure 2 Diurnal cycle of mean temperature (top) and relative humidity (bottom) during the first period (green) and second period (black). The standard deviation is shown by the green and grey shaded area.




Figure 3 Wind direction during the first period (left) and second period (right).

Technical comments; 1. Page 3 line30: 10 l/min, change it as 10 L/min. 2. Page 5 line 9: fro m -> from 3. Page 8 line 9: please add wavelength for Angstrom exponent. 4. Figure 1 c. Is the scale is log scale for volume depolarization? If yes, could you change it as normal scale? The value of volume depolarization ratio is look too different between two periods.

Comments 1-3 are applied to the manuscript. We prefer to keep Fig. 1c in log scale, because the depolarization ratio, especially in the first period, is better visible as can be seen in the comparison between linear and log scale shown in Fig.4. However, we changed the color bar label of Fig.1c in the manuscript to make the log scale better recognizable.




Figure 4 Comparison of Figure 1 without logarithmic scale (left) and with logarithmic scale (right).

Reply to Referee #2

Thank you for carefully reading the manuscript and providing useful suggestions to improve the paper. Replies to your comments are given below.

General comments: The authors presented lidar detection and classification of pollen species (birch and spruce) mainly based on depolarization ratio of them. The data together with backscatter coefficient, extinction coefficient, lidar ratio and Angstrom exponent of pollen that they measured are very basic and useful parameters for lidar studies. However, more focused discussion on the local aerosol except for pollen is required for the paper to be accepted. Comments are given below.

Specific comments:

1 Title: "multi-wavelength Raman lidar" should be better to be changed to (for example) "multi-wavelength scattering lidar with several lidar parameters", because Raman data was only used to derive water vapor mixing ratio (is this correct?) that is not main point of the content.

The used lidar instrument is a multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar. In addition to the determination of the water vapor mixing ratio, Raman measurements are also used to derive the lidar ratio, which is an important property for particle typing. We therefore prefer to keep the specification of our lidar system in the title. However the title was changed to "Detection and characterization of birch pollen in the atmosphere using multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar and Hirst-type pollen sampler in Finland" to emphasis the synthesis of lidar and pollen collector.

2 Introduction: Please survey and show other methods/techniques of pollen detection such as CCD detection with imaging analysis, fluorescence lidars and others, so that authors can appeal features of their lidar to readers who are not only lidar researchers but also the wide range of them.

A paragraph about other pollen detection methods was added in the introduction, as:

"The majority of these stations operate Hirst-type volumetric air sampler. These traditional pollen traps are operated manually, which requires human resources and is time consuming. In the recent years, novel techniques have been developed to enable automated pollen monitoring and reduce workload. Those techniques use, for example, automated image recognition (Oteros et al., 2015) or fluorescence spectra (Crouzy et al., 2016) to identify pollen types and could enable a systematic pollen monitoring on ground level in near real-time."

3 Two cases: I want to know the reason why you selected only the two cases, the first period on 6 May 2016 between 23:00 and 01:00 and the second period on 15 May 2016 between 19:00 and 21:00. During 5-9 May, most of observations showed much higher concentration of birch pollen than that of first period you selected. And also, it seems better to discuss the influence of spruce pollen by using data in the morning on 13 May (13/05/16, Fig. 1) as spruce pollen concentration was higher than that in the second period.

The first case was chosen because we assume less contamination with anthropogenic aerosol during 6 May than during the period 8-9 May, when the concentration of birch pollen was much higher. During those days trajectories show that air masses travelled over the European continent e.g. Germany, which could have caused a contamination with anthropogenic aerosols. We want to show a case with minimal contamination of other aerosols. The second case study was chosen because we want to show Raman measurements (which are only possible during night time with less background light) with all lidar-derived parameters. 15 May was the only possible period suitable for lidar analysis (i.e. no low clouds and sufficient signal-to-noise ratio) although the spruce pollen concentration is higher on 13 May.

4 Aerosols: There are several descriptions for the possible existence of local aerosols other than pollen, p. 4 line 13, p. 5 line 22, p. 8, line17 and others. Nevertheless, the content of the paper seems to insist too much on the influence of pollen alone.

To check the background aerosol at our measurement site, lidar measurements during different times of the year have been checked. The particle depolarization ratio of the ground-near aerosol layer during the winter months of 2015 and 2016 are shown in Fig.1a. The winter time was selected to ensure the absence of pollen. Backward trajectories have been checked and measurements with distinct aerosol layers were omitted. The mean PDR during normal days without influence of pollen or other depolarizing aerosols is $4\pm 1\%$, which is smaller than during the pollen-influenced period. Also pollen-free periods during spring and summer time, which means no pollen have been counted by the Hirst-type pollen collector, have been checked and are shown in Fig1 b, c. The mean values of PDR during those periods was $3.5\pm 1\%$ in March/May and $3.9\pm 1\%$ in July/August. However, during spring and summer the absence of pollen in the atmosphere cannot be confirmed with absolute certainty even if there are no pollen collected by the Hirst-type sampler.

As the depolarization ratio of cases without detected pollen on ground-level or other depolarizing aerosol is below 4% and therefore significantly lower than during the presented pollination period, the particle depolarization ratio can be used to detect the presence of pollen in the atmosphere.

Information about background aerosol was added in section 4.2., as:

“However the effect of the background particles has to be considered. Lidar measurements during the winter months of 2015 and 2016 and during pollen-free periods in spring and summer 2016 have been analyzed to determine the effect of background aerosol at our measurement site. During winter time the absence of pollen can be ensured, but there is a possibility that pollen also have been present in the atmosphere during spring and summer when no pollen were detected by the Hirst-type sampler on ground. Nevertheless, values of mean PDR at 532 nm are below 4% during all analyzed periods with no observed pollen concentration. Since the PDR during the pollination period is significantly higher than the PDR of the background aerosol, the depolarization ratio can be used as an indicator for detecting the presence of pollen.”




Figure 5 Histograms of mean PDR within the lowest aerosol layer during January 2015 and 2016 (A) and pollen-free cases during March/May 2016 (B) and July/August 2016 (C).

5 Hirst-type volumetric air sampler: Relating to #3, please describe the detailed results about solid particles, except for pollens, found/collected with the air sampler. There may be much amount of particles generated from the ground around the local area where the lidar measurements were done. Couldn't you find any particles which showed depolarization? I think these particles are more important to understand the lidar results than air mass derived with backward trajectories.

The analysis of the collection tape of the Hirst-type air sampler only involves the examination of pollen grains. Other particles are not counted or analyzed. During the selected pollination period no other instruments measuring the depolarization were available. It is therefore not possible to make any statements about other depolarization particles close to the ground. However, the effect of depolarizing particles originating from the ground, can be considered negligible at the latitudes the lidar data is used. Also if such depolarizing particles were frequently present, this would be visible in the PDR values of days without pollen.

6 Range: The line 4 in page 5 describes "we only consider the lowest layer in the following analysis". It was at around 1 km. But Fig. 3 showing range up to 2.5 -3 km makes readers confused. Authors also described that data can be retrieved down to around 500 m. That data is important for comparison with the sampler data.

The lowest layer is used because the highest amount of local pollen is likely located in the layer closest to the ground. However our profiles cannot be extended down to ground-level. Theoretically profiles can be determined with overlap correction down to 500 m. However in this study the lower limit of our profiles is at around 800 m with a vertical smoothing of 25 bins (750 m) and a time average of 2 hours. Data below could not be used for comparison with the sampler data. The profile ranges used for calculation of mean values (pollen layer) is marked grey in Fig.3. Nevertheless the profiles are shown up to 3 km to give more information about the vertical aerosol distribution. A comment about the pollen layers shown in grey was added to the caption of Fig.3 and clarification that profiles are only reliable starting from 800 m in this study was added in the section 2.1, as:

“In this study, the lower limit of reliable profiles of vertically smoothed and temporally averaged optical properties is at around 800 m.”

Technical comments: Technical word and its prefix, such as particle depolarization ratio and PDR, lidar ratio and LR, frequently appears at random to each other, please unify them through the whole paper.

Technical words and their abbreviations have been unified.

Reply to the additional comments of referee #2

Comments to the reply:

#2 Introduction

Please consider referring the following two papers on pollen monitoring with a fluorescence lidar, S.C. Richardson et al, Science of the Total Environment 696 (2019) 133906 and Y. Saito et al, Remote Sensing 10 (2018) 1533. These will help clarify the characteristics of your method/system.

Thank you. The mentioned paper references were added to clarify the use of fluorescence lidars to detect pollen.

#3 Two cases

I think it would be better to add such a description you replied. Readers wonder why only two short cases (2hours x 2days) were focused on in the study. You have made a great effort on the long time observation for 11 days.

An explanation was added, as:

In the choice of case studies, backward trajectories have been considered to select cases with minimal contamination with of other aerosol. Furthermore nighttime Raman measurements were chosen to present all lidar-derived parameters including the retrieved LR profile.

#5 Hirst-type volumetric air sampler

Is “the effect of depolarizing particles originating from the ground, can be considered negligible at the latitude the lidar data is used.” correct? Various kinds of ground particles can be carried up to several kilometers where lidars can work well. I think some ones of them show a certain depolarizing. Does “Also if such depolarizing particles were frequently present, this would be visible in the PDR values of days without pollen.” mean that your lidar only reacts to especially pollen? It is hard to think so.

We meant that if we would have a lot of depolarizing particles in the height of our observation, we would observe high depolarization ratios also during periods without pollen, because other particles sources from the ground are not linked to the pollination time. Measurements without pollen however show a relatively low PDR of around 4%.

Reply to Dr. Holger Baars

Thank you for your comments! Below you find our detailed response to each question.

Methodology:

1) If you speak about concentration of Pollen you refer to the number concentration, but what does this mean in terms of the surface concentration and the volume concentration which are the important parameters for backscatter and extinction of light? Can you clarify with typical sizes from the detected Pollen?

Thank you for this comment! Typical sizes of pollen are given in the results section. Also a comment about the volume concentration was added when explaining the effect of spruce pollen on the measured values despite the low number concentration contribution, as:

The Ångström exponent in the second period is around 0.8, whereas it is around 1 in the first period, demonstrating the effect of the larger spruce pollen (~90-110 μm), even with a small contribution (~14%) to the total pollen number concentration. But considering the different volume of birch and spruce pollen grains, the contribution of spruce to the total volume concentration exceeds 75% in the second period, which explains the large effect of spruce pollen on the measured optical properties even with a small number concentration.

2) Furthermore, can you provide a table with the optical and microphysical properties of the different Pollen types you analyse as detected in the laboratory, e.g. the depolarization ratio (Cao et al.), average density of Pollen, refractive index, and fall velocity (would be interesting as most Pollen have good flight behaviour.)

Thank you, this is a good suggestion, but optical and microphysical properties of both of the pollen types are either not reported in literature yet or vary significantly as for example the hydration of pollen grains varies and affects the density and therefore the fall velocity. A comment about the fall velocity of birch pollen was added in the result section, but because spruce pollen are much less studied and to our knowledge there are no laboratory measurements of optical properties of spruce pollen yet, we prefer not to provide a table as it would be incomplete and it is not crucial for the understanding of our study.

3) A discussion on the flight behaviour would be beneficial to relate the lidar measurements to the surface measurements. One could imagine that if particles are too large and too heavy and have thus a high fall velocity they would not make it up to the heights of the lidar observations (this could, e.g. another reason for your changing particle depolarization with height: Is the size distribution of the observed Pollen types nearly one size or can they change?).

Airborne pollen are designed in a way so that the grains can be dispersed by wind. Bigger and thus heavier pollen grains possess air bladders, which increase the surface area of the grain without adding much mass. This increases the amount of drag and decrease the settling velocity of the pollen grains. In this way it is also possible for big pollen grains to be lifted and dispersed by wind. In various studies e.g. Skjøth, 2007; Rousseau, 2008; Szczepanek, 2017, the long range transport of pollen has been shown. The size distribution of pollen within one pollen type is usually narrow. The size varies only little within one specie (Mäkelä, 1996; Kishchenko and Tikhova, 2019). A comment about the flight behavior of pollen is added in section 4.1., as:

Pollen are low density particles, which makes them more sensitive to air currents, reduces the settling velocity and allows them to be lifted by turbulent air flows. Birch pollen, for example, have a gravitational settling velocity of around 1 cm s^{-1} (Sofiev et al., 2006). This settling velocity is similar to anthropogenic aerosol smaller than $10 \mu\text{m}$ (PM10) although birch pollen grains are more than twice the size. The air bladders on the bigger spruce pollen grains increase the surface area of the grain without adding much mass, and therefore decrease the settling velocity. Hence, even those big pollen grains can be lifted up to several kilometers and be dispersed by wind over thousands of kilometers as have been shown by several studies on the long distance transport of pollen (Rousseau et al., 2008; Skjøth et al., 2007; Szczepanek et al., 2017).

4) You state that during your observations the lidar ratio of Pollen stays the same while depolarization changes. What theoretical optical properties do you expect from, e.g., scattering calculations? Is there any literature available? Can you explain how the depolarization of the laser light is working at this size range?

Unfortunately there are no theoretical optical properties for the observed pollen types under ambient conditions, e.g. hydrated pollen. The paper by Cao et al. provides experimental values for various pollen types but doesn't have any values for example for spruce pollen. Furthermore dry pollen grains were used which have different optical properties. We will try to obtain scattering simulations for future studies as theoretical reference values for the optical properties of different pollen types under different environmental conditions.

Case studies:

5) Line 15ff: you state that birch Pollen (20-30 μm) are smaller than spruce (70-100 μm) and therefore the Ångström exponent is higher when only birch is prevailing. However, considering the laser wavelength and the size of the particles, I would expect an Ångström exponent of 0 for all particles (size parameter well above 0). Can you state on this?

The Ångström exponent we are measuring is not the Ångström exponent of pure pollen. Also background aerosol contributes to the observed optical properties. We assume that pollen have a contribution to the Ångström, but the derivation from 0 is caused by the background aerosol. We are working on separation techniques of pollen and background aerosol to gain pure pollen properties without the effect of background aerosol, but this is not in the scope of this study.

6) Derived optical parameters: Are the Pollen probably aligned in a certain way that they can fly better and might therefore a difference in the observed optical properties in comparison to laboratory measurements occur?

Pollen grains with air bladder, e.g. spruce pollen, align with their air bladders upwards when drifting in the air. (Schwendemann, 2007) and also the almost spherical birch pollen were found to have an orientation when falling (Sassen, 2011; Tränke and Mielke, 1994). This could also partly explain differences between ambient measurements and laboratory experiments, this thought is added in the manuscript as:

Also the orientation of the pollen grains in the atmosphere has to be considered. Pollen with air bladders, e.g. spruce pollen, are known to align with their air bladders upwards when drifting in the air (Schwendemann et al., 2007) and also a certain orientation of the almost spherical birch pollen grains was observed (Sassen, 2011; Tränke and Mielke, 1994). This could cause differences in the measured optical properties if the orientation of the particles in laboratory experiments is not considered and the irregularly shaped particles are observed from different angles.

Idea:

7) As you have determined the particle depolarization ratio of pure birch and you know the contribution of both constituents during the mixed birch/spruce period, couldn't you calculate the theoretical depolarization ratio of pure spruce by applying the depolarization separation formula of Tesche, 2009, JGR. If I am right, you will need to convert your number concentrations to surface concentrations to obtain the backscatter fraction.

This is a good idea, but we don't determine the particle depolarization of pure birch. We are providing the depolarization ratio for a period with birch pollen including background aerosol. The fraction/contribution of background aerosol cannot be determined with the setup during the presented campaign, which complicates the determination of the pure spruce depolarization. However, we are working on a method to estimate the pure PDR of different pollen and it will be the topic of a future paper which is going to be submitted soon.

Detection and characterization of birch pollen in the atmosphere using multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar and Hirst-type pollen sampler in Finland

Stephanie Bohlmann¹, Xiaoxia Shang¹, Elina Giannakaki^{1,2}, Maria Filioglou¹, Annika Saarto³, Sami Romakkaniemi¹ and Mika Komppula¹

¹Finnish Meteorological Institute, P.O. Box 1627, 70211 Kuopio, Finland

²Department of Environmental Physics and Meteorology, University of Athens, 15784 Athens, Greece

³Biodiversity Unit, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland

Correspondence to: Stephanie Bohlmann (stephanie.bohlmann@fmi.fi)

Abstract. We present the results of birch pollen characterization using lidar and in-situ measurements based on a 11-day pollination period from 5 to 15 May 2016 at the European Aerosol Research Lidar Network (EARLINET) station in Vehmasmäki (Kuopio, 62°44'N, 27°33'E), Finland. The ground-based multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar Polly^{XT} performed continuous measurements at this rural forest site and has been combined with a Hirst-type volumetric air sampler which measured the pollen type and concentration on roof level (4 m). The period was separated into two parts due to different atmospheric conditions and detected pollen types. During the first period, high concentrations of birch pollen were measured with a maximum two-hour average pollen concentration of 3700 grains/m³. Other pollen types represented less than 3% of the total pollen count. In observed pollen layers, the mean particle depolarization ratio at 532 nm was $10 \pm 6\%$ during the intense birch pollination period. Mean lidar ratios were found to be 45 ± 7 and 55 ± 16 sr at 355 and 532 nm, respectively. During the second period, birch pollen was still dominant but a significant contribution of spruce pollen was observed as well. Spruce pollen grains are highly non-spherical, leading to a larger mean depolarization ratio of $26 \pm 7\%$ of the birch-spruce pollen mixture. Furthermore, higher lidar ratios were observed during this period with a mean value of 60 ± 3 and 62 ± 10 sr at 355 and 532 nm, respectively. The presented study shows the potential of the particle depolarization ratio to track pollen grains in the atmosphere.

1 Introduction

Atmospheric pollen is a well-known health threat as it can irritate the respiratory system and cause asthmatic symptoms (Bousquet et al., 2008). The number of people suffering from pollen triggered diseases is rising (Schmidt, 2016) and the prevalence of pollen allergies is likely to further increase due to climate change as the pollination season becomes longer and the pollen production increases (Lake et al., 2018). In addition to the well-known allergenic impacts, pollen also affect the climate (IPCC, 2013; WHO, 2003). Steiner et al. (2015) suggested that fragments of pollen act as cloud condensation nuclei

(CCN) and therefore influence cloud optical properties. Pollen can furthermore change ice cloud formation processes by acting as ice nuclei (IN) (von Blohn et al., 2005; Diehl et al., 2001, 2002).

Worldwide, 879 active stations continuously monitor pollen type and concentration near ground level in 2016 (Buters et al., 2018). The majority of these stations operate Hirst-type volumetric air sampler. These traditional pollen traps are operated manually, which requires human resources and is time consuming. In the recent years, novel techniques have been developed to enable automated pollen monitoring and reduce workload. Those techniques use, for example, automated image recognition (Oteros et al., 2015) or fluorescence spectra (Crouzy et al., 2016; Richardson et al., 2019; Saito et al., 2018) to identify pollen types and could enable a systematic pollen monitoring on ground level in near real-time. Systematic information on the vertical distribution, however, is missing. Models are using phenological and meteorological data to forecast concentration and dispersion of pollen in the atmosphere. But observations, especially in the vertical direction, to evaluate the model results are rare or missing. Light detection and ranging (lidar) is an effective method to investigate the vertical distribution of aerosols, as it enables measurements with high vertical and temporal resolution under ambient conditions. Recently, the signature of pollen grains has been observed in lidar measurements (Noh et al., 2013a, 2013b; Sassen, 2008; Sicard et al., 2016). It has been revealed that non-spherical pollen generate strong laser depolarization and thus the information on particle shape can be retrieved. For example, Sassen (2008) measured a linear depolarization ratio at 694 nm up to 30% for paper birch in Alaska. In controlled laboratory experiments, Cao et al. (2010) measured the linear depolarization ratio of different pollen types and determined a linear depolarization ratio at 532 nm for paper birch of 33%. In the absence of other depolarizing particles, the depolarization ratio could therefore be used to track pollen grains. Lidar-derived depolarization ratio profiles thus can provide information about the vertical distribution of pollen, which could result in an improvement of the model input parameters and serve as validation for model results.

Within our study, we aim to improve and deepen the knowledge of optical properties of pollen in the atmosphere by using a multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar. Finland provides suitable conditions for the observation of pollen as 78% of Finland's total area is forest land and sources of other highly depolarizing particles like dust are absent. Hence the contamination with other aerosols is considered to be small. During a four months measurement campaign in 2016, the multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar Polly^{xT} (Engelmann et al., 2016) performed continuous measurements at the rural forest station in Vehmasmäki (Kuopio) which is part of the European Aerosol Research Lidar Network (EARLINET). Simultaneously, a Hirst-type volumetric air sampler was operated to obtain pollen type and concentration at roof level. Twenty-one different pollen types were detected from May to August 2016. In this study, we focus on the description of birch pollen and the mixture of birch and spruce pollen as birch is one of the most allergenic pollen types and the most allergenic tree pollen in northern, central and eastern Europe (D'Amato et al., 2007).

2 Measurement site and instrumentation

Our measurement campaign took place from the beginning of May to the end of August 2016 at Vehmasmäki, Finland (62°44' N, 27°33'E, 190 m asl); a rural forest site 18 km from the city center of Kuopio, Eastern Finland. The measurement site was equipped with a multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar Polly^{XT} (Sect.2.1) and a Hirst-type pollen sampler (Sect.2.2). With this set-up it is possible to combine vertical profiles of the aerosol properties above the site and the pollen concentration on ground. Due to the location of the site, far from major aerosol sources like dust or anthropogenic aerosol, mainly surrounded by forest, the atmosphere is relatively clean and suitable for pollen studies.

2.1 Lidar: Polly^{XT}

Lidar measurements were conducted with the multi-wavelength Raman polarization lidar Polly^{XT} (Althausen et al., 2009; Baars et al., 2016; Engelmann et al., 2016). Polly^{XT} has three emission wavelengths (355, 532 and 1064 nm) and seven detection channels. In addition to the three emitted wavelengths, the backscattered signals at the in-elastic Raman-shifted wavelengths (387, 407 and 607 nm) and the cross-polarized signal at 532 nm are detected. During nighttime, extinction and backscatter coefficient profiles at 355 and 532 nm can be determined independently using the Raman method (Ansmann et al., 1992). During daytime, the Klett-Fernald method (Fernald, 1984; Klett, 1981) is applied using the elastic signals due to the low signal-to-noise ratio at the Raman channels. The signal at the Raman-shifted wavelength (407 nm) is used to determine water vapor mixing ratio profiles during dark hours (Filioglou et al., 2017). The simultaneous measurement of the cross-polarized and total backscattered light at 532 nm enables the determination of the linear particle depolarization ratio (PDR, Freudenthaler et al. (2009)), which allows the characterization of particle shape (Sassen, 2005). The measurement of multiple wavelengths allows the retrieval of Ångström exponents (\AA), which are related to the particle size. The ratio of extinction to backscatter coefficient is called lidar ratio (LR). It is considered an important criterion for particle characterization, as it depends on single scattering albedo and backscatter phase function and therefore on the size distribution and the chemical composition of the aerosol particle. The LR is therefore considered to be aerosol type dependent.

The operated lidar system has an initial spatial resolution of 30 m and a temporal resolution of 30 s. Due to the bi-axial set-up of emission and detection units, the height of complete overlap between the laser and the receiver field-of-view is reached at about 800-900 m (Engelmann et al., 2016). An overlap correction can be applied on the basis of a simple technique proposed by Wandinger and Ansmann (2002), which allows to extend profiles down to around 500 m. In this study, the lower limit of reliable profiles of vertically smoothed and temporally averaged optical properties is at around 800 m. Uncertainties in nighttime lidar-products are mainly determined by signal noise and the correction of Rayleigh scattering. The overall relative errors of the lidar-derived optical properties retrieved with the Raman method are in the range of 5–10% for backscatter coefficients and depolarization ratios and 10–20% for extinction coefficients (Ansmann et al., 1992; Baars et al., 2012). These uncertainties propagate to the retrieved Ångström exponents and LRs.

Further details on the set-up, principle and error propagation of Polly^{XT} can be found in Althausen et al. (2009) and Engelmann et al. (2016). Near-real-time measurements and Polly^{XT} data can be accessed at the PollyNET website (<http://polly.tropos.de/>).

2.2 Pollen collector: Hirst-type volumetric air sampler

5 A Hirst-type volumetric air sampler located next to the lidar, 4 m above ground, monitored the pollen concentration and type. This type of spore sampler enables continuous 7-day collection of pollen grains with 2 hour time resolution. The sampling principle is based on the design described by Hirst (1952). With a flow rate of 10 L/min air is drawn into the sampling device through a 14 mm × 2 mm orifice. A large wind vane on a rotatable sampler head makes the sampler sensitive to changes in wind direction and ensures that the orifice is always oriented towards the wind. Particles impact on an
10 adhesive-coated plastic tape beneath the orifice. For this study, the tape, fixed on a rotating drum, was changed every seven days and the pollen grains impacted on the tape were further analyzed under the microscope. The pollen type was determined using characteristic features of the examined pollen grains. By converting the counted spores on the sample tape surface in relation to the inlet air flow, the pollen concentration was obtained.

3 Methodology

15 Figure 1 shows the temporal variation of the pollen concentration (a), the range corrected signal at 1064 nm (b) and the volume depolarization ratio at 532 nm (c) during the period 5 – 15 May 2016. This period represents the main birch pollination season of 2016 as 83% of the annual birch pollen have been collected during this time. A relatively large aerosol load was observed within the planetary boundary layer up to ~ 3.5 km. As shown in Fig. 1c, the volume depolarization ratio ranges between 4-10% suggesting the presence of non-spherical particles. A detailed examination of the air masses arriving
20 during this period along with modelled dust load using the BSC-DREAM8b model (Basart et al., 2012) confirms the absence of dust in middle and northern Europe. Additionally, MODIS data (MODIS, 2019) were synergistically used to exclude smoke aerosol layers from biomass burning. Hence, the highly depolarizing aerosol layers were likely attributed to pollen, keeping in mind that some contamination with local anthropogenic aerosol is always possible.

Ground-level pollen concentration values presented in Fig.1 (a) were used to verify the strong pollination event in the
25 beginning of May which provides 50% of the annual birch pollen concentration. The event started in the evening (17:00 UTC) of 5 May and lasted until 9 May noon (hereafter called period 1). During period 1, the two-hour average pollen concentration exceed 1000 grains/m³ in 53% of the time. The majority of pollen type identified was birch (97%) with a very small contribution of willow (2%) and other pollen types (1%). From 12 to 15 May (period 2), the mean pollen concentration was significantly lower. Only 8% of the time, the total pollen concentration was higher than 1000 grains/m³. In addition to
30 birch (82%), spruce pollen (14%) and other pollen types (4%) were detected. This variation can be explained by the different meteorological conditions during the two periods. A different predominant wind direction during the two periods was

observed, which probable cause the different mixture of pollen types. The most frequent wind direction in period 1 was northwest, whereas in period 2 the air masses were mainly advected from southeast. When comparing the diurnal cycle of temperature and relative humidity measured at ground level, we found higher temperature values and lower relative humidity during period 1 compared with period 2. Temperature and pollen concentration have been shown to be positive correlated, whereas pollen concentration and relative humidity show a negative correlation (Bartková-Ščevková, 2003). The different pollen concentration could therefore be partly explained by variations of temperature and humidity.

The ground-near aerosol layers are assumed to contain the highest concentration of local pollen and are defined as pollen layers in this study. The gradient method was applied to determine the bottom and top layer heights of the pollen layers (Bösenberg and Matthias, 2003; Flamant et al., 1997; Mattis et al., 2008). The local maximum in the first derivative of the 1064 nm backscatter coefficient was considered to be the bottom of the layer. The local minimum was considered to be the layer top. To verify the determined layers, the layer boundaries identified by the gradient method were compared with the bottom and top heights of coherent structures in the height-time illustration of the range-corrected signal (Giannakaki et al., 2015). The layer identification was based on the assumption that the optical properties should be relatively homogeneous, which means within one layer, the variability of the optical properties should be lower than the statistical uncertainty of the individual data points. Two layers with a vertical distance less than 100 m apart from each other were combined to one layer. All layers detected during the 11 days period are shown in Fig. 2. Black, magenta, blue and yellow bars show the first, second, third and fourth layer, respectively. Triangles mark the part of the layer which was used for calculations of the mean optical properties of the layer. The lower limit for reliable profiles during our measurement period was at around 800 m. Since the closest layer to the ground is assumed to contain the highest pollen concentration and share, we only consider the lowest layers (black) in the following analysis.

4 Results & Discussion

4.1 Case studies

We present two case studies representative for different pollen mixtures: in the first case study only birch pollen have been detected by the Hirst-type sampler. In the second case study, spruce pollen was detected in addition to birch. In the choice of case studies, backward trajectories have been considered to select cases with minimal contamination with of other aerosol. Furthermore nighttime Raman measurements were chosen to present all lidar-derived parameters including the retrieved LR profile. Figure 3 shows, from left to right, the particle backscatter coefficient at 355 (blue), 532 (green) and 1064 nm (red); the particle extinction coefficient at 355 (dashed blue) and 532nm (dashed green); the LR at 355 (blue) and 532 nm (green); the PDR at 532 nm (light green); the Ångström exponents calculated both from the backscatter coefficient at 355-532nm (blue) and 532-1064 nm (red) and from extinction coefficients at 355-532 nm (black); and the relative humidity from lidar-derived water vapor profiles (black) and temperature profiles from radiosonde launched at 18 UTC (orange). Lidar-derived

optical properties were vertically smoothed using a sliding average of 25 bins (750 m). Four-day backward trajectories ending at the height of the layers and the middle of the time period are shown as well.

The first case study was selected during the intense birch pollination event (period 1). On 6 May 2016 between 23:00 and 01:00 UTC only birch pollen was detected. Using the layer definition methodology (Sect. 3), three layers were determined and the two lowest ones have been combined to one pollen layer for this analysis since their distance is less than 100 m.

Four-day HYSPLIT (Hybrid Single Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory) backward trajectories (Stein et al., 2015) ending at 450 m and 1.1 km on 7 May 0:00 UTC show that the air masses are advected from western directions and have travelled over the British Isles, the North Sea and southern Sweden. The contamination with depolarizing aerosol like dust is therefore considered to be negligible, however the mixture with other anthropogenic aerosol cannot be ruled out. The presumed birch pollen layer was observed up to 1.2 km. Extinction coefficient at 355 nm is about $22 \pm 2 \text{ Mm}^{-1}$ and $13 \pm 1 \text{ Mm}^{-1}$ at 532 nm. The mean LR for the observed layer is $49 \pm 4 \text{ sr}$ and $70 \pm 7 \text{ sr}$ at 355 and 532 nm, respectively. Mean backscatter and extinction-related Ångström exponents at 355-532 nm are 2.1 ± 0.04 and 1.1 ± 0.5 , respectively. The backscatter-related Ångström exponent between 532 and 1064 nm is 0.9 ± 0.1 . The mean PDR at 532 nm within the layer is $14 \pm 1\%$. Note that it can be even higher close to the ground, below the height of complete overlap. The PDR decreases with increasing height, while the LR is constant. Thus the measured LR may not be a good indicator for characterizing the observed birch pollen in these cases as the contribution of pollen is assumed to decrease with increasing distance to the pollen source.

During our second case study on 15 May 2016 between 19:00 and 21:00 UTC, spruce pollen have been measured simultaneously to the birch pollen. Profiles and backward trajectories are shown in the lower panel of Fig.3. The pollen layer reaches up to 1.7 km.

The extinction coefficients at 355 and 532 nm are higher than in the previous case, accounting to $61 \pm 5 \text{ Mm}^{-1}$ at 355 nm and $44 \pm 6 \text{ Mm}^{-1}$ at 532 nm. The mean LR is $55 \pm 6 \text{ sr}$ at 355 nm and $51 \pm 9 \text{ sr}$ at 532 nm. The backscatter and extinction-related Ångström exponents at 355-532 nm are lower than in the first case with values of 0.5 to 0.7 and 0.1 to 1.7, respectively. The backscatter-related Ångström exponent at 532-1064 nm is 0.8 to 1.0.

The PDR at 532 nm is on average $19 \pm 2\%$ and 24% at its maximum and is clearly higher than in the case when only birch pollen were observed (period 1). The air masses arriving in the height of the layers on 15 May 20 UTC have been advected from Russia and remained close to the ground only the last 12 hours before reaching the site. The contamination with depolarizing dust can therefore be neglected. An explanation for the higher depolarization of the backscattered light is the non-spherical shape of the spruce pollen grains which have been detected in addition to birch pollen.

Figure 4 shows micrographs of birch and spruce pollen grains. Birch pollen (left picture) have a diameter around 20-30 μm , are almost spherical and possess three pores on the edge of the grain. Spruce pollen grains, on the other hand, possess two air bladders and are clearly non-spherical. Furthermore those pollen grains are significantly larger, with their longest axis diameter ranging between 90 - 110 μm (including air bladders).

Pollen are low density particles, which makes them more sensitive to air currents, reduces the settling velocity and allows them to be lifted by turbulent air flows. Birch pollen, for example, have a gravitational settling velocity of around 1 cm s^{-1} (Sofiev et al., 2006). This settling velocity is similar to anthropogenic aerosol smaller than $10 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ (PM10) although birch pollen grains are more than twice the size. The air bladders on the bigger spruce pollen grains increase the surface area of the grain without adding much mass, and therefore decrease the settling velocity. Hence, even those big pollen grains can be lifted up to several kilometers and be dispersed by wind over thousands of kilometers as have been shown by several studies on the long distance transport of pollen (Rousseau et al., 2008; Skjøth et al., 2007; Szczepanek et al., 2017).

4.2 Lidar derived optical parameters

All pollen layers between 5 and 15 May have been identified and analyzed to determine the relationship between pollen type and the lidar-derived optical properties of the aerosol layer. Figure 5a shows the LR at 532 nm against the PDR at the same wavelength for all Raman measurements during nighttime. Measurements during the first intense birch pollination period are shown in green color, while measurements during the second period, when spruce pollen was detected simultaneous to birch pollen, are shown in black. The size of the dots represents the measured pollen concentration by the Hirst-type sampler at ground level. The standard deviation is shown by the error bars. Lidar ratio values range from 31 to 74 sr. This wide range of LRs suggest that the LR alone is not a suitable parameter for the characterization of pollen as other aerosol types also show characteristic values in this range. However, the mean PDR within the pollen layers during the first period is $10 \pm 6\%$, which is significantly higher than that of anthropogenic pollution. In the absence of other depolarizing aerosol, e.g. dust, pollen is therefore likely the dominant aerosol causing this depolarization. Depolarization ratios higher than 15% are only observed during the second period (12-15 May) in which spruce pollen were present. The mean LR and PDR at 532 nm during this period are $62 \pm 10 \text{ sr}$ and $21 \pm 3\%$, respectively. The significantly higher PDR is caused by the non-spherical shape of spruce pollen in those layers. In Fig. 5b, the backscatter-related Ångström exponent between 532 and 1064 nm is shown against the PDR at 532 nm for all measurements between 5 and 15 May, including Klett retrievals for daytime measurements (dotted markers). A clear tendency to smaller Ångström exponents with increasing depolarization ratios in both periods can be seen. This correlation indicates that the influence of non-spherical particles on the backscattered signal increases with decreasing Ångström exponent, i.e. bigger particles. The Ångström exponent in the second period is around 0.8, whereas it is around 1 in the first period, demonstrating the effect of the larger spruce pollen ($\sim 90\text{-}110 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$), even with a small contribution ($\sim 14\%$) to the total pollen number concentration. But considering the different volume of birch and spruce pollen grains, the contribution of spruce to the total volume concentration exceeds 75% in the second period, which may explain the large effect of spruce pollen on the measured optical properties even with a small number concentration. However, the effect of the background particles has to be considered. Lidar measurements during the winter months of 2015 and 2016 and during pollen-free periods in spring and summer 2016 have been analyzed to determine the effect of background aerosol at our measurement site. During winter time the absence of pollen can be ensured, but there is a

possibility that pollen also have been present in the atmosphere during spring and summer when no pollen were detected by the First-type sampler on ground. Nevertheless, values of mean PDR at 532 nm are below 4% during all analyzed periods with no observed pollen. Since the PDR during the pollination period is significantly higher than the PDR of the background aerosol, the depolarization ratio can be used as an indicator for detecting the presence of pollen. The Ångström exponent on

5 the other hand can be also related to the amount and type of background aerosol and is therefore less representative here.

Earlier studies show that the relative humidity can affect size and shape of the pollen grains and therefore lead to different optical properties (Franchi et al., 1984; Griffiths et al., 2012; Katifori et al., 2010). When pollen grains dehydrate, the pollen wall can fold onto itself to prevent further dehydration, this phenomena is known as harmomegathy (Katifori et al., 2010).

The shape of the pollen grain changes, which could lead to significantly higher depolarization of the backscattered light. At
10 humid conditions, pollen grains swell by taking up water internally and after reaching a relative humidity over 89% external wetting of the pollen surface can occur (Griffiths et al., 2012). To check whether the ambient relative humidity affects our measurements, the Ångström exponent (532-1064 nm) and the PDR at 532 nm are presented against the relative humidity in Fig. 6. In the selected measurement period, the relative humidity ranged between 40-65%. In this humidity range, Ångström exponent (Fig. 6a) and depolarization ratio (Fig. 6b) do not show any correlation with the relative humidity. Thus, our
15 measurements were not affected by extreme humidity events and represent values for pollen under ambient atmospheric conditions in the spring season in Finland. However, lidar measurements of relative humidity profiles are only available during nighttime. The relative humidity in the observed pollen layers during daytime could be smaller. This could result in occasional folding of the pollen grains and higher depolarization ratios. This hypothesis could also explain the higher depolarization ratios of about 25% of few Klett measurements of birch pollen during the first period.

20 Table 1 summarizes the mean intensive properties together with the associated standard derivation (STD), range and median in the first (birch) period of our campaign. The contribution of other pollen types in this period was small. Those values, therefore, can be considered to be characteristic for birch pollen dominated aerosol conditions. Table 2 shows the same properties for the spruce contaminated period. Lidar ratio and PDR are higher when spruce is detected simultaneously with birch. The PDR values for birch pollen are considerably lower than previously determined in lidar studies. A linear
25 depolarization ratio up to 30% at 694 nm was detected by Sassen (2008) for paper birch in Alaska. And under controlled laboratory environment, Cao et al. (2010) measured a linear depolarization ratio at 532 nm of 33% for dried paper birch pollen. We assume that those high depolarization values can be caused by dry birch pollen grains, which fold and change their shape when dehydrating. Under ambient conditions the pollen grains are more spherical and therefore less depolarizing. Also the orientation of the pollen grains in the atmosphere has to be considered. Pollen with air bladders, e.g. spruce pollen,
30 are known to align with their air bladders upwards when drifting in the air (Schwendemann et al., 2007) and also an orientation of the almost spherical birch pollen grains was observed (Sassen, 2011; Tränkle and Mielke, 1994). This could cause differences in the measured optical properties if the orientation of the particles in laboratory experiments is not considered and the irregularly shaped particles are observed from different angles.

5 Conclusion

Particle depolarization ratios of about 10% have been observed during a birch pollination event in Vehmasmäki, Finland. When more non-spherical pollen, e.g. spruce, are present, the **particle** depolarization ratio can be as high as 26%. Those depolarization ratios are similar to dust and biomass burning aerosol mixtures (Tesche et al., 2011) or dust mixtures with marine aerosol (Groß et al., 2011), thus pollen could easily be misclassified as dusty mixtures. The mean **LRs** show a wide range of values depending on the mixing of different pollen types in the atmosphere. The mean **LR** at 355 nm vary between 46 ± 8 sr (first period) and 60 ± 3 sr (second period) and at 532 nm between 52 ± 12 sr (first period) and 62 ± 10 sr (second period). Those **LRs** are characteristic for dust or dust-smoke mixtures (Tesche et al., 2011), which complicates the characterization of pollen using the **LR**. Also the **backscatter-related Ångström exponent at 532-1064 nm**, which is around 1.0 for the intense birch pollination period and around 0.8 for the spruce contaminated period, is similar to characteristic values for smoke and dust-smoke mixtures, respectively. Thus, in order to distinguish between pollen and other aerosol types, all three parameters and backward trajectories as well as possible dust and biomass-burning aerosol sources have to be considered.

The presented data show the potential of lidar measurements to detect pollen in the atmosphere. Nevertheless, there are challenges which need to be addressed in order to improve the characterization of optical properties of airborne pollen. First, the minimum height of the usable lidar signal needs to be as low as possible. **By operating a lidar system with a low full-overlap height or additional near-field channels, the coverage of lower heights can be significantly improved.** Second, the contribution of other aerosol types like anthropogenic pollution has to be determined. Therefore, more multi-wavelength lidar studies with depolarization characterization on atmospheric pollen are necessary.

20 Data availability

Lidar data is available upon request from the authors and data quicklooks are available on PollyNET website (<http://polly.tropos.de/>). Trajectories are calculated with the NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) HYSPLIT (HYbrid Single-Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory) model (<https://ready.arl.noaa.gov/HYSPLIT.php>, accessed: 30/04/2019). Fire data is available at the NASA Worldview application (<https://worldview.earthdata.nasa.gov>, accessed: 30/04/2019). BSC-DREAM8b model simulations are operated by the Barcelona Supercomputing Center and are available at <https://ess.bsc.es/bsc-dust-daily-forecast/> (accessed: 30/04/2019).

Author contribution

SB, XS and MF performed the lidar data analysis. AS analyzed the pollen samples. MK and EG initiated the measurement campaign. All authors contributed to the scientific discussion and the manuscript preparation.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgement

This project was supported by the Academy of Finland (project no. 310312). We acknowledge the use of data and imagery of BSC-DREAM8b simulations performed by the Barcelona Supercomputing Center and from the NASA Worldview application (<https://worldview.earthdata.nasa.gov>), part of the NASA Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS). We thank the NOAA Air Resources Laboratory (ARL) for the provision of the HYSPLIT transport and dispersion model used in this publication.

References

- 10 Althausen, D., Engelmann, R., Baars, H., Heese, B., Ansmann, A., Müller, D. and Komppula, M.: Portable Raman lidar PollyXT for automated profiling of aerosol backscatter, extinction, and depolarization, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 26, 2366–2378, doi:10.1175/2009JTECHA1304.1, 2009.
- Ansmann, A., Wandinger, U., Riebesell, M., Weitkamp, C. and Michaelis, W.: Independent measurement of extinction and backscatter profiles in cirrus clouds by using a combined Raman elastic-backscatter lidar, *Appl. Opt.*, 31, 7113–7131, 1992.
- 15 Baars, H., Ansmann, A., Althausen, D., Engelmann, R., Heese, B., Müller, D., Artaxo, P., Paixao, M., Pauliquevis, T. and Souza, R.: Aerosol profiling with lidar in the Amazon Basin during the wet and dry season, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117(D21), doi:10.1029/2012JD018338, 2012.
- Baars, H., Kanitz, T., Engelmann, R., Althausen, D., Heese, B., Komppula, M., Preißler, J., Tesche, M., Ansmann, A., Wandinger, U., Lim, J.-H., Ahn, J. Y., Stachlewska, I. S., Amiridis, V., Marinou, E., Seifert, P., Hofer, J., Skupin, A.,
- 20 Schneider, F., Bohlmann, S., Foth, A., Bley, S., Pfüller, A., Giannakaki, E., Lihavainen, H., Viisanen, Y., Hooda, R. K., Pereira, S. N., Bortoli, D., Wagner, F., Mattis, I., Janicka, L., Markowicz, K. M., Achtert, P., Artaxo, P., Pauliquevis, T., Souza, R. A. F., Sharma, V. P., van Zyl, P. G., Beukes, J. P., Sun, J., Rohwer, E. G., Deng, R., Mamouri, R.-E. and Zamorano, F.: An overview of the first decade of PollyNET: an emerging network of automated Raman-polarization lidars for continuous aerosol profiling, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16(8), 5111–5137, doi:10.5194/acp-16-5111-2016, 2016.
- 25 Bartková-Ščevková, J.: The influence of temperature, relative humidity and rainfall on the occurrence of pollen allergens (*Betula*, *Poaceae*, *Ambrosia artemisiifolia*) in the atmosphere of Bratislava (Slovakia), *Int. J. Biometeorol.*, 48(1), 1–5, doi:10.1007/s00484-003-0166-2, 2003.
- Basart, S., Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Cuevas, E. and Baldasano, J. M.: Development and evaluation of the BSC-DREAM8b dust regional model over Northern Africa, the Mediterranean and the Middle East, *Tellus B*, 64, 18539,
- 30 doi:10.3402/tellusb.v64i0.18539, 2012.

- von Blohn, N., K. Mitra, S., Diehl, K. and Borrmann, S.: The ice nucleating ability of pollen: Part III: New laboratory studies in immersion and contact freezing modes including more pollen types, *Atmos. Res.*, 78, 182–189, doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2005.03.008, 2005.
- Bösenberg, J. and Matthias, V.: EARLINET: A European Aerosol Research Lidar Network to Establish an Aerosol
5 Climatology., MPI Rep., 348, 6–31, 2003.
- Bousquet, J., Khaltaev, N., Cruz, A. A., Denburg, J., Fokkens, W. J., Togias, A., Zuberbier, T., Baena-Cagnani, C. E., Canonica, G. W., Van Weel, C., Agache, I., Ait-Khaled, N., Bachert, C., Blaiss, M. S., Bonini, S., Boulet, L.-P., Bousquet, P.-J., Camargos, P., Carlsen, K.-H., Chen, Y., Custovic, A., Dahl, R., Demoly, P., Douagui, H., Durham, S. R., Van Wijck, R. G., Kalayci, O., Kaliner, M. A., Kim, Y.-Y., Kowalski, M. L., Kuna, P., Le, L. T. T., Lemiere, C., Li, J., Lockey, R. F.,
10 Mavale-Manuel, S., Meltzer, E. O., Mohammad, Y., Mullol, J., Naclerio, R., O’Hehir, R. E., Ohta, K., Ouedraogo, S., Palkonen, S., Papadopoulos, N., Passalacqua, G., Pawankar, R., Popov, T. A., Rabe, K. F., Rosado-Pinto, J., Scadding, G. K., Simons, F. E. R., Toskala, E., Valovirta, E., Van Cauwenberge, P., Wang, D.-Y., Wickman, M., Yawn, B. P., Yorgancioglu, A., Yusuf, O. M., Zar, H., Annesi-Maesano, I., Bateman, E. D., Kheder, A. Ben, Boakye, D. A., Bouchard, J., Burney, P., Busse, W. W., Chan-Yeung, M., Chavannes, N. H., Chuchalin, A., Dolen, W. K., Emuzyte, R., Grouse, L.,
15 Humbert, M., Jackson, C., Johnston, S. L., Keith, P. K., Kemp, J. P., Klossek, J.-M., Larenas-Linnemann, D., Lipworth, B., Malo, J.-L., Marshall, G. D., Naspitz, C., Nekam, K., Niggemann, B., Nizankowska-Mogilnicka, E., Okamoto, Y., Orru, M. P., Potter, P., Price, D., Stoloff, S. W., Vandenplas, O., Viegi, G. and Williams, D.: Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) 2008*, *Allergy*, 63(s86), 8–160, doi:10.1111/j.1398-9995.2007.01620.x, 2008.
- Buters, J. T. M., Antunes, C., Galveias, A., Bergmann, K. C., Thibaudon, M., Galán, C., Schmidt-Weber, C. and Oteros, J.:
20 Pollen and spore monitoring in the world, *Clin. Transl. Allergy*, 8(1), 9, doi:10.1186/s13601-018-0197-8, 2018.
- Cao, X., Roy, G. and Bernier, R.: Lidar polarization discrimination of bioaerosols, *Opt. Eng.*, 49, doi:10.1117/1.3505877, 2010.
- Crouzy, B., Stella, M., Konzelmann, T., Calpini, B. and Clot, B.: All-optical automatic pollen identification: Towards an operational system, *Atmos. Environ.*, 140, 202–212, doi:10.1016/J.ATMOSENV.2016.05.062, 2016.
- 25 D’Amato, G., Cecchi, L., Bonini, S., Nunes, C., Annesi-Maesano, I., Behrendt, H., Liccardi, G., Popov, T. and van Cauwenberge, P.: Allergenic pollen and pollen allergy in Europe, *Allergy*, 62(9), 976–990, doi:10.1111/j.1398-9995.2007.01393.x, 2007.
- Diehl, K., Quick, C., Matthias-Maser, S., Mitra, S. K. and Jaenicke, R.: The ice nucleating ability of pollen Part I: Laboratory studies in deposition and condensation freezing modes, *Atmos. Res.*, 58, 75–87, doi:10.1016/S0169-
30 8095(01)00091-6, 2001.
- Diehl, K., Matthias-Maser, S., Jaenicke, R. and Mitra, S. K.: The ice nucleating ability of pollen: Part II. Laboratory studies in immersion and contact freezing modes, *Atmos. Res.*, 61, 125–133, doi:10.1016/S0169-8095(01)00132-6, 2002.
- Engelmann, R., Kanitz, T., Baars, H., Heese, B., Althausen, D., Skupin, A., Wandinger, U., Komppula, M., Stachlewska, I. S., Amiridis, V., Marinou, E., Mattis, I., Linné, H. and Ansmann, A.: The automated multiwavelength Raman polarization

- and water-vapor lidar PollyXT: the neXT generation, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9(4), 1767–1784, doi:10.5194/amt-9-1767-2016, 2016.
- Fernald, F. G.: Analysis of atmospheric lidar observations: some comments, *Appl. Opt.*, 23, 652–653, 1984.
- Filioglou, M., Nikandrova, A., Niemelä, S., Baars, H., Mielonen, T., Leskinen, A., Brus, D., Romakkaniemi, S., Giannakaki, E. and Komppula, M.: Profiling water vapor mixing ratios in Finland by means of a Raman lidar, a satellite and a model, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 10(11), 4303–4316, doi:10.5194/amt-10-4303-2017, 2017.
- Flamant, C., Pelon, J., Flamant, P. H. and Durand, P.: Lidar determination of the entrainment zone thickness at the top of the unstable marine atmospheric boundary layer, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.*, 83(2), 247–284, doi:10.1023/A:1000258318944, 1997.
- 10 Franchi, G. G., Pacini, E. and Rottoli, P.: Pollen grain viability in *Parietaria judaica* L. during the long blooming period and correlation with meteorological conditions and allergic diseases, *G. Bot. Ital.*, 118(3–4), 163–178, doi:10.1080/11263508409426670, 1984.
- Freudenthaler, V., Esselborn, M., Wiegner, M., Heese, B., Tesche, M., Ansmann, A., Müller, D., Althausen, D., Wirth, M., Fix, A., Ehret, G., Knippertz, P., Toledano, C., Gasteiger, J., Garhammer, M. and Seefeldner, M.: Depolarization ratio
15 profiling at several wavelengths in pure Saharan dust during SAMUM 2006, *Tellus Ser. B*, 61, 165–179, 2009.
- Giannakaki, E., Pfüller, A., Korhonen, K., Mielonen, T., Laakso, L., Vakkari, V., Baars, H., Engelmann, R., Beukes, J. P., Van Zyl, P. G., Josipovic, M., Tiitta, P., Chiloane, K., Piketh, S., Lihavainen, H., Lehtinen, K. E. J. and Komppula, M.: One year of Raman lidar observations of free-tropospheric aerosol layers over South Africa, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15(10), 5429–5442, doi:10.5194/acp-15-5429-2015, 2015.
- 20 Griffiths, P. T., Borlace, J.-S., Gallimore, P. J., Kalberer, M., Herzog, M. and Pope, F. D.: Hygroscopic growth and cloud activation of pollen: a laboratory and modelling study, *Atmos. Sci. Lett.*, 13(4), 289–295, doi:10.1002/asl.397, 2012.
- Groß, S., Tesche, M., Freudenthaler, V., Toledano, C., Wiegner, M., Ansmann, A., Althausen, D. and Seefeldner, M.: Characterization of Saharan dust, marine aerosols and mixtures of biomass-burning aerosols and dust by means of multi-wavelength depolarization and Raman lidar measurements during SAMUM 2, *Tellus B*, 63(4), doi:10.1111/j.1600-
25 0889.2011.00556.x, 2011.
- Hesse, M., Halbritter, Heidemarie Zetter, R., Weber, M., Buchner, R. and Frosch-Radivo, Andrea Ulrich, S.: *Pollen Terminology: An illustrated handbook*, SpringerWienNewYork., 2009.
- Hirst, J. M.: An automatic volumetric spore trap, *Ann. Appl. Biol.*, 39(2), 257–265, doi:10.1111/j.1744-7348.1952.tb00904.x, 1952.
- 30 IPCC: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Stocker, T.F., Qin, G.-K., Plattner, M., Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P. M. Midgley, Cambridge University Press., 2013.
- Katifori, E., Alben, S., Cerda, E., Nelson, D. R. and Dumais, J.: Foldable structures and the natural design of pollen grains, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 107(17), 7635 LP – 7639, doi:10.1073/pnas.0911223107, 2010.

- Klett, J. D.: Stable analytical solution for processing lidar returns, *Appl. Opt.*, 20, 211–220, 1981.
- Lake, I. R., Jones, N. R., Agnew, M., Goodess, C. M., Giorgi, F., Hamaoui-Laguel, L., Semenov, M. A., Solmon, F., Storkey, J., Vautard, R. and Epstein, M. M.: Erratum: “Climate Change and Future Pollen Allergy in Europe,” *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 126(7), 079002, doi:10.1289/EHP2073, 2018.
- 5 Mattis, I., Müller, D., Ansmann, A., Wandinger, U., Preißler, J., Seifert, P. and Tesche, M.: Ten years of multiwavelength Raman lidar observations of free-tropospheric aerosol layers over central Europe: Geometrical properties and annual cycle, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D20202, doi:10.1029/2007JD009636, 2008.
- MODIS: MODIS Collection 6 NRT Hotspot / Active Fire Detections MCD14DL. Available on-line [https://earthdata.nasa.gov/firms]. doi: 10.5067/FIRMS/MODIS/MCD14DL.NRT.006, 2019.
- 10 Noh, M. Y., Müller, D., Lee, H. and Choi, T.: Influence of biogenic pollen on optical properties of atmospheric aerosols observed by lidar over Gwangju, South Korea, *Atmos. Environ.*, 69, 139–147, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.12.018, 2013a.
- Noh, Y. M., Lee, H., Müller, D., Lee, K., Shin, D., Shin, S., Choi, T. J., Choi, Y. J. and Kim, K. R.: Investigation of the diurnal pattern of the vertical distribution of pollen in the lower troposphere using LIDAR, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13(15), 7619–7629, doi:10.5194/acp-13-7619-2013, 2013b.
- 15 Oteros, J., Pusch, G., Weichenmeier, I., Heimann, U., Möller, R., Röseler, S., Traidl-Hoffmann, C., Schmidt-Weber, C. and Buters, J. T. M.: Automatic and Online Pollen Monitoring, *Int. Arch. Allergy Immunol.*, 167(3), 158–166, doi:10.1159/000436968, 2015.
- Richardson, S. C., Mytilinaios, M., Foskinis, R., Kyrou, C., Papayannis, A., Pyrri, I., Giannoutsou, E. and Adamakis, I. D. S.: Bioaerosol detection over Athens, Greece using the laser induced fluorescence technique, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 696, 133906, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.133906, 2019.
- Rousseau, D.-D., Schevin, P., Ferrier, J., Jolly, D., Andreasen, T., Ascanius, S. E., Hendriksen, S.-E. and Poulsen, U.: Long-distance pollen transport from North America to Greenland in spring, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences*, 113(G2), doi:10.1029/2007JG000456, 2008.
- 25 Saito, Y., Ichihara, K., Morishita, K., Uchiyama, K., Kobayashi, F. and Tomida, T.: Remote Detection of the Fluorescence Spectrum of Natural Pollens Floating in the Atmosphere Using a Laser-Induced-Fluorescence Spectrum (LIFS) Lidar, *Remote Sens.*, 10(10), doi:10.3390/rs10101533, 2018.
- Sassen, K.: Polarization in lidar, in *Lidar: Range-Resolved Optical Remote Sensing of the Atmosphere*, edited by C. Weitkamp, pp. 19–42, Springer., 2005.
- 30 Sassen, K.: Boreal tree pollen sensed by polarization lidar: Depolarizing biogenic chaff, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35(18), L18810, doi:10.1029/2008GL035085, 2008.
- Sassen, K.: Elliptical pollen corona from North American boreal paper birch trees (*Betula papyrifera*): strong fall orientations for near-spherical particles, *Appl. Opt.*, 50(28), F1–F5, doi:10.1364/AO.50.0000F1, 2011.
- Schmidt, C. W.: Pollen Overload: Seasonal Allergies in a Changing Climate, *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 124(4), A70–A75,

- doi:10.1289/ehp.124-A70, 2016.
- Schwendemann, A. B., Wang, G., Mertz, M. L., McWilliams, R. T., Thatcher, S. L. and Osborn, J. M.: Aerodynamics of saccate pollen and its implications for wind pollination, *Am. J. Bot.*, 94(8), 1371–1381, doi:10.3732/ajb.94.8.1371, 2007.
- Sicard, M., Izquierdo, R., Alarcón, M., Belmonte, J., Comerón, A. and Baldasano, J. M.: Near-surface and columnar measurements with a micro pulse lidar of atmospheric pollen in Barcelona, Spain, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16(11), 6805–6821, doi:10.5194/acp-16-6805-2016, 2016.
- Skjøth, C. A., Sommer, J., Stach, A., Smith, M. and Brandt, J.: The long-range transport of birch (*Betula*) pollen from Poland and Germany causes significant pre-season concentrations in Denmark, *Clin. Exp. Allergy*, 37(8), 1204–1212, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2222.2007.02771.x, 2007.
- 10 Sofiev, M., Siljamo, P., Ranta, H. and Rantio-Lehtimäki, A.: Towards numerical forecasting of long-range air transport of birch pollen: theoretical considerations and a feasibility study, *Int. J. Biometeorol.*, 50(6), 392, doi:10.1007/s00484-006-0027-x, 2006.
- Stein, A. F., Draxler, R. R., Rolph, G. D., Stunder, B. J. B. and Cohen, M. D.: NOAA’s HYSPLIT Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling System, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 96(12), 2059–2077, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00110.1, 2015.
- 15 Steiner, A. L., Brooks, S. D., Deng, C., Thornton, D. C. O., Pendleton, M. W. and Bryant, V.: Pollen as atmospheric cloud condensation nuclei, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42(9), 3596–3602, doi:10.1002/2015GL064060, 2015.
- Szczepanek, K., Myszkowska, D., Worobiec, E., Piotrowicz, K., Ziemianin, M. and Bielec-B\kakowska, Z.: The long-range transport of Pinaceae pollen: an example in Kraków (southern Poland), *Aerobiologia (Bologna)*, 33(1), 109–125, doi:10.1007/s10453-016-9454-2, 2017.
- 20 Tesche, M., Groß, S., Ansmann, A., Müller, D., Althausen, D., Freudenthaler, V. and Esselborn, M.: Profiling of Saharan dust and biomass-burning smoke with multiwavelength polarization Raman lidar at Cape Verde, *Tellus B*, 63(4), 2011.
- Tränkle, E. and Mielke, B.: Simulation and analysis of pollen coronas, *Appl. Opt.*, 33(21), 4552–4562, doi:10.1364/AO.33.004552, 1994.
- Wandinger, U. and Ansmann, A.: Experimental determination of the lidar overlap profile with Raman lidar, *Appl. Opt.*, 41, 25 511–514, 2002.
- WHO: World Health Report 2003: A Vision for Global Health, Shaping the Future, World Heal. Organ., 2003.




Figure 1: Overview of the 11 days birch pollen period. (A) Pollen concentration obtained from Hirst-type pollen sampler, (B) Range-corrected signal at 1064 nm and (C) Volume depolarization ratio at 532 nm. Dashed vertical lines mark the period of the case studies.

5




Figure 2: Layer definition during the measurement period 5-15 May. Definition of layers explained in Sect. 3. Colors mark the upper layers, which were not used for further analysis. Triangles mark lower and upper limit of the area used for calculation.




Figure 3: Two case studies of different pollen mixture cases. Top: Period 1, 06.05.2016 23:00-01:00, only birch pollen was collected by the Hirst-type volumetric air sampler. Bottom: Period 2, 15.05.2016 19:00-21:00, birch and spruce pollen were collected. Left: profiles of backscatter- and extinction coefficients, particle depolarization and lidar ratio, Ångström exponents, relative humidity (derived from lidar measurements) and temperature profiles (18 UTC radio sounding). Right: 4-day HYSPLIT backward trajectories. Defined pollen layers are marked in grey.





Figure 4: Pollen micrographs. Left: Birch (*Betula pendula*) pollen grain (source: Hesse et al., 2009), right: Spruce (*Picea abies*) pollen grains (source: the Biodiversity Unit of the University of Turku / Kari Kaunisto)



5 Figure 5: Mean values of optical properties of the detected pollen layers during the period 5 to 15 May, error bars denote the standard deviation, size the pollen concentration. Color denotes the measurement period. Green dots are measured from 5-10 May, black dots from 12-15 May. Solid dots indicate Raman retrievals, dotted markers the Klett solution. (A) Lidar ratio at 532 nm vs particle depolarization ratio at 532 nm, (B) Backscatter-related Ångström exponent at 532-1064 nm vs particle depolarization ratio at 532 nm.




Figure 6: Dependence of the backscatter-related Ångström exponent at 532-1064 nm (A) and the particle depolarization ratio at 532 nm (B) on the relative humidity for all Raman measurements of pure and mixed birch cases during the first period (5-10 May, green) and the second period (12-15 May, black).

- 5 Table 1: Mean values, range and median of optical properties of the detected pollen layers in the first measurement period: 5-10 May, **intense birch pollination** period.

Parameter		Mean \pm STD	Range	Median
Layer top height [km]		1.3 ± 0.3	1.0 - 2.2	1.2
Backscatter coeff. [Mm ⁻¹ sr ⁻¹]	355 nm	0.7 ± 0.5	0.1 - 2.4	0.7
	532 nm	0.3 ± 0.2	0.1 - 1.0	0.3
	1064 nm	0.2 ± 0.1	0.1 - 0.4	0.2
Extinction coeff. [Mm ⁻¹]	355 nm	33.0 ± 13.3	20.0 - 68.2	30.9
	532 nm	19.0 ± 6.5	11.0 - 34.4	19.1
Lidar ratio [sr]	355 nm	46 ± 8	34 - 60	46
	532 nm	52 ± 12	31 - 74	53
PDR	532 nm	0.10 ± 0.06	0.03 - 0.26	0.08
Number of pollen layers:		all: 41	Raman: 10	

Table 2: Mean values, range and median of optical properties of the detected pollen layers in the second measurement period: 12-15 May, spruce contaminated period.

Parameter	Mean \pm STD	Range	Median
Layer top height [km]	1.3 \pm 0.4	1 – 2.2	1.1
Backscatter coeff. 355 nm	0.7 \pm 0.2	0.3 – 1.1	0.6
[Mm⁻¹sr⁻¹] 532 nm	0.5 \pm 0.2	0.3 – 0.8	0.4
1064 nm	0.3 \pm 0.1	0.2 – 0.4	0.2
Extinction coeff. 355 nm	52.9 \pm 13.1	26.9 – 60.9	58.5
[Mm⁻¹] 532 nm	40.0 \pm 9.5	24.6 – 54.6	40.2
Lidar ratio [sr] 355 nm	60 \pm 3	55 – 64	59
532 nm	62 \pm 10	49 – 77	60
PDR 532 nm	0.26 \pm 0.07	0.18 – 0.39	0.24
Number of pollen layers:	all: 12	Raman: 5	