

# ***Interactive comment on “Effect of changing NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime on the seasonality and long-term trends of satellite-observed tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> columns over China” by Viral Shah et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 2 September 2019

General Comments: Shaw et al present a combined model, satellite, and ground-based approach to disentangle the effects of changing NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime on observed column NO<sub>2</sub>. The results of this study, and studies like this, are of great importance to the community seeking to utilize remote sensing approaches to infer trends in emissions. It has been well established that NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime is dependent on NO<sub>x</sub> concentration (due to the feedback on HO<sub>x</sub>) especially in the extremes of high and low [NO<sub>x</sub>] leading to strong spatial variability in NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime. There has been less focus on variability in tau(NO<sub>x</sub>) at a fixed location can impact calculated NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and the impact of NO<sub>x</sub> on tau(NO<sub>x</sub>) beyond its control on HO<sub>x</sub>.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



The manuscript is well written and within the scope of ACP. I recommend that it be published following the authors attention to the following comments.

#### Specific Comments:

1. Model resolution: To what extent does model spatial resolution impact the results? If I am not mistaken, the model resolution is approximately 50 x 50 km in the study region. I would expect that O<sub>3</sub> titration would display significant variability on this scale and that the mean modeled  $P(\text{NO}_3) = k[\text{NO}_2][\text{O}_3]$ , which is driving the nocturnal NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime, may not correspond to that calculated at smaller spatial scales? It would be helpful for the authors to comment on the extent to which model resolution is important and what direction the effects of resolution may have on calculations in NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime.

2. N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> to NO<sub>3</sub> ratio: The N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> / NO<sub>3</sub> ratio also scales with [NO<sub>x</sub>]. With decreasing NO<sub>x</sub>, this ratio decreases and L(NO<sub>3</sub>) becomes more important than L(N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>). To what extent is this important here, or is the nocturnal NO<sub>x</sub> lifetimes essentially all limited by P(NO<sub>3</sub>) and  $L(\text{N}_2\text{O}_5 + \text{NO}_3) \gg P(\text{NO}_3)$ ? While this may not impact the retrieval of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions trends, it could have a sizeable effect on nitrate aerosol formation rates.

3. ClNO<sub>2</sub> branching fraction: What is the mechanism for ClNO<sub>2</sub> in the model? What is the distribution of ClNO<sub>2</sub> branching fractions? Does this change in time? If 30-50% of NO<sub>x</sub> is lost to N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, ClNO<sub>2</sub> has the potential to return half of this. A short section on the parameterization used and the uncertainty in this (most measurements show that parameterizations of ClNO<sub>2</sub> branching fractions are much larger than observations) should be included. I appreciate that NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime may not be that dependent on aerosol surface area, but the net NO<sub>x</sub> removal is certainly dependent on the ClNO<sub>2</sub> branching fraction.

---

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

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

