

Interactive comment on “Effect of changing NO_x lifetime on the seasonality and long-term trends of satellite-observed tropospheric NO₂ columns over China” by Viral Shah et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 20 August 2019

The study examines and compares the trends of spaceborne NO₂ columns and bottom-up NO_x emissions (MEIC) over Eastern China. The observed NO₂ trends between 2012 and 2017 appear consistent with the emission trends in summer as well as in winter, when taking into account changes in the NO_x lifetimes during that period. GEOS-Chem simulations for the years 2012 and 2017 indicate very little change in the summertime NO_x lifetime, due to the compensation of higher daytime OH and lower nighttime aerosol loss; in winter, however, the increasing trend in nighttime ozone appears to drive a decreasing trend of the NO_x lifetime, due to the large share of the overall NO_x sink being due to N₂O₅ hydrolysis on aerosols. These model findings appear consistent with the comparison of MEIC emissions and OMI columns.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



The topic of the paper is very significant since the community and policy-makers will be interested by further information on NO_x emission trends and how they relate to NO₂ data. The paper is clear and well written. However, I am not entirely convinced by the robustness of the conclusions.

Major comments

For one thing, uncertainties should be better acknowledged and (wherever possible) evaluated. Given the importance of the aerosol sink in the discussion of the trends, sensitivity studies are necessary to demonstrate that the conclusion holds despite uncertainties in aerosol surface densities and especially in the N₂O₅ uptake coefficient. I understand that the NO₂+O₃ reaction might be the main limiting factor to N₂O₅ loss, at least during the winter, but it might not be the case during summer, and in any case it requires more than just qualitative arguments. It is worth noting that campaign data (e.g. Brown et al., JGR 114, D00F10, doi:10.1029/2008JD011679, 2009) suggested much lower N₂O₅ uptake coefficients than those (Bertram and Thornton) used in GEOS-Chem.

A second major comment is related to the calculation of NO_x lifetimes (Figure 3), which are averages for the bottom 0-2 km of the atmosphere. I assume that the values given (about 6 hours in the summer and 21-27 hours in winter) are 24-hour averages. Two issues arise: 1) in summer, the relevant lifetime for OMI NO₂ columns is the average NO_x lifetime during the few (~6) hours preceding the satellite overpass time (13:30 LT); and 2) the vertical profile of the OMI sensor sensitivity should be taken into account. I know that at least 70% of the columns lies below 2 km altitude, but the sensitivity profile is very steep and very anti-correlated with the NO₂ vmr profile, even below 2 km. Furthermore, the part of the column lying above 2 km altitude is non-negligible and might have very different trends from the lowermost part. I suspect that taking these effects into account will increase the relative importance of NO₂+OH to the total loss, with possibly significant consequences for the trend and for the seasonal evolution.

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

Minor comments:

- line 112 how important is the correction using GEOS-Chem simulated concentrations of HNO₃ and organic nitrates?

- why not use the ground-based NO₂ measurements to evaluate the trends?

- I. 135 the NO₂ hydrolysis coefficient is said to be decreased from 10^{-4} to 10^{-5} . Relative to what study or what model version? Is this value used for all RH and all aerosol types? Jaeglé et al. (JGR 2018) use 10^{-4} and assume that the reaction makes only HONO (i.e. no HNO₃), which would lead to very high HONO/NO₂ ratios over China. A comment on this would be appreciated.

- what is the model performance for aerosol surface density over China?

- I. 136-138 This gives the impression that the well-known issue of the HONO missing sources has been solved, which is not the case, since many other sources have been proposed to explain the observations. What is the contribution of NO₂ hydrolysis to the NO_x sink in the simulations?

I. 172-174 The NO₂ column measurement and the surface NO₂ measurement represent different times, therefore the similar winter-summer ratios are not necessarily expected.

I. 186 Regarding the aerosol loss, a discussion of the uptake coefficient is required (see above, major comment)

I. 187-190 and Figure 4: not useful for the discussion, could possibly be dropped.

- Figure 1: I suggest to indicate on each plot, the domain-averaged NO₂ column

Technical comments:

- the reference Manders et al. (2017) is missing

- the reference Bertram and Thornton (2009) is missing

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

- references: use journal abbreviations

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-670>, 2019.

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

