

## ***Interactive comment on “Simulation of radon-222 with the GEOS-Chem global model: Emissions, seasonality, and convective transport” by Bo Zhang et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 17 September 2020

As far as I am aware of, this study presents the most comprehensive piece of work to date using  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  to evaluate atmospheric transport and mixing on a global scale. It includes the assessment of four  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  emission scenarios, a CTM driven by two meteorological data sets, and the comparison of simulations with practically all atmospheric  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  observations currently available, including vertical profiles. The clear structure of the paper, its great readability and meaningful displays make it a pleasure to read. It leaves no open question to me. There is very little that I can suggest to further improve it.

Minor comments

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Differences between simulated and observed atmospheric concentrations occur for various reasons. One is the bias in measurement techniques, especially the underestimation of  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  concentrations derived from  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  progeny measurements near the surface ( $< 100$  m above ground; cf. Grossi et al., 2020). Further,  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  concentration gradients within the first few metres above ground can be steep (e.g. Chambers et al., 2011). Several of the atmospheric observations in China were done between 1 and 1.5 m above ground (Jin et al., 1998, cited in Zhang et al, 2011, cited in the present study), which might explain some of the difference between simulation and observation for those sites. Are those sites represented in Figure 6 e-h by points indicating simulated values more than a factor of two smaller than observed values (or, better, observed values exceeding simulated values by more than a factor of two)?

Figure 6, y-axis label in the second row (Panel e) is "Observed ..." Should this not be "Simulated ...", as in the other rows?

Page 19, lines 7 and 8: "The seasonality in surface  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  concentrations is mainly affected by three factors: (1) the surface  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  emission flux rate determined by radium content and soil conditions; ..." This sentence is subject to eventual misinterpretation, in the way that radium content may be misunderstood as being seasonally variable. I would suggest to change the sentence to something like: "The seasonality in surface  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  concentrations is mainly affected by three factors: (1) seasonality in surface  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  emission flux rate resulting from seasonal changes in soil moisture, diffusivity, depth of the water table, snow and ice cover; ..."

Page 24, lines 1 and 2: Some  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  flux measurements from Antarctic soil are reported in Evangelista and Pereira (2002).

As mentioned in the text, there are vast regions without atmospheric  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  observations. Perhaps suggest, where from a modeller's perspective it would be desirable to see an atmospheric  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  detector established. Personally, I would very much like to see that happen at the tall tower (300 m) at Zotino ( $60^\circ$  N  $90^\circ$  E), in the middle of

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

Siberia (<http://www.zottoproject.org/index.php/Main/Home>).

## References

Chambers et al. (2011) Separating remote fetch and local mixing influences on vertical radon measurements in the lower atmosphere. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2011.00565.x>

Grossi et al. (2020) Intercomparison study of atmospheric  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  and  $^{222}\text{Rn}$  progeny monitors. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-2241-2020>

Evangelista and Pereira (2002) Radon flux at King George Island, Antarctic Peninsula. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0265-931X\(01\)00137-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0265-931X(01)00137-0)

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2020-804>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

