Influence of convection on the upper tropospheric O$_3$ and NO$_x$ budget in southeastern China

Response to Anonymous Referee #3

Xin Zhang, Yan Yin, Ronald van der A, Henk Eskes, Jos van Geffen, Yunyao Li, Xiang Kuang, Jeff L. Lapierre, Kui Chen, Zhongxiu Zhen, Jianlin Hu, Chuan He, Jinghua Chen, Rulin Shi, Jun Zhang, Xingrong Ye, and Hao Chen

February 4, 2022
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General Comments

(1) Since LNO<sub>x</sub> is a key component of this study, affecting both O<sub>3</sub> chemistry and NO<sub>2</sub> and LNO<sub>x</sub> air mass factors, it would be helpful to show several examples of WRF-Chem vertical profiles of these constituents for the two cases under different PE assumptions near and downwind of convection. For example, NO<sub>2</sub>, LNO<sub>2</sub> and LNO<sub>x</sub> profiles could be discussed in the context of the O<sub>3</sub> profiles of Fig. 4 and the ∆AMFs of Fig. 6. If feasible, it also would be interesting to compare the profiles with the standard profiles from TM5 used in the TROPOMI data product to illustrate the importance of local effects.

Thanks for your suggestions. We have added another short section to discuss the effects of LNO<sub>x</sub> on O<sub>3</sub> profile using integrated reaction rate (IRR) results. Beside, the TM5, NO<sub>2</sub>, LNO<sub>2</sub> and LNO<sub>x</sub> profiles are also added to the supplement.

Impact of lightning NO<sub>x</sub> on the O<sub>3</sub> profile

Furthermore, the IPR outputs including LNO emission are compared with these excluding LNO to explore the effects of LNO<sub>x</sub> on O<sub>3</sub> (Table R1). The LNO<sub>x</sub> reduces the net O<sub>3</sub> production by 25 % and 40 % during the convective period and life cycle of the 2019 case, respectively. The decreased chemistry contribution is less significant (≤ 1%) for the 2020 case which has a smaller lightning density near the station. Note that the LNO<sub>x</sub> can certainly enhance the downwind ozone production on the scale of days (Pickering et al., 1996; DeCaria et al., 2005). Therefore, it is necessary to estimate the LNO<sub>x</sub> PE accurately (discussed later in Sect. 6.2).

Table R1. Process analysis table for the mean O<sub>3</sub> integrated tendencies (10–14 km).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>LNO (mol/flash)</th>
<th>advh + advz&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>chem&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>net&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Cycle</td>
<td>2019-07-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.3 (-24.6 %)</td>
<td>16.7 (124.6 %)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03:20–05:40</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-2.3 (-28.8 %)</td>
<td>10.3 (128.8 %)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020-09-01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4 (9.6 %)</td>
<td>32.0 (90.4 %)</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04:20–06:40</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.4 (12.1 %)</td>
<td>31.9 (87.8 %)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convective Period</td>
<td>2019-07-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-19.6 (140.0 %)</td>
<td>5.6 (-40.0 %)</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04:20–05:00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-20.0 (114.3 %)</td>
<td>2.5 (-14.3 %)</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020-09-01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9.7 (-131.1 %)</td>
<td>17.1 (231.1 %)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05:40–06:20</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-10.1 (-148.5 %)</td>
<td>16.9 (248.5 %)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>*</sup>The unit is 10<sup>10</sup> molec. cm<sup>−3</sup>. The percentage is the proportion of each part in the net O<sub>3</sub> change.

Additionally, the convection was divided into three regions by TROPOMI data: fresh lightning, downwind of fresh lightning, and aged lightning (See Sect. 6.1 and Fig. R5 for details). Firstly, the difference of O<sub>3</sub> (∆O<sub>3</sub>) profiles is obtained with different LNO PE assumption (Fig. R1a–c). In contrast with the net loss of ozone (< 4 ppbv) over all height levels in Ott et al. (2007), the ∆O<sub>3</sub> is mostly positive (< 1 ppbv) between 2 km and 5 km and negative (> -3 ppbv) between 5 km and 12 km in our cases. The higher PE (700 mol/flash) slightly reduces the O<sub>3</sub> concentration by less than 1 ppbv at all levels compared with the default PE (500 mol/flash) and it even leads to negative ∆O<sub>3</sub> between 2 km and 5 km downwind of fresh lightning (Fig. R1b). The maximum O<sub>3</sub> loss is between 8 km and 10 km due to the peak of LNO<sub>x</sub> (up to 2.6 ppbv) introduced in the model.

Then, the integrated reaction rate (IRR) is applied to determine the chemistry mechanism and the effect of LNO on the O<sub>3</sub> variation for two layers where the ∆O<sub>3</sub> is opposite: 800 hPa–500 hPa (∆O<sub>3</sub> > 0) and 500 hPa–200 hPa (∆O<sub>3</sub> < 0). The tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> is mainly controlled by five reaction rate terms (Pickering
\[
\frac{d}{dt}[O_3] = k_1[NO][HO_2] + \sum_i k_i[NO][R_iO_2]
\]

\[-k_3[H_2O][O(^1D)] - k_4[HO_2][O_3] - k_5[OH][O_3]
\]

where \( k_i \) is the rate coefficient of the reaction between peroxy radicals (\( R_iO_2 \)) and NO. The time series of each contribution to \( O_3 \) production are illustrated in Fig. R1d–i. Overall, the time series of IRR are more variable for the 2019 case due to the stronger activity as clarified in Sect. 4. The total net chemistry production of \( O_3 \) keeps positive for both layers. In detail, the reaction between NO and HO\(_2\) always dominates the production while the oxidation of NO by RO\(_2\) is about 40 %–60 % of that production. The dominant loss of \( O_3 \) is the photolysis (described by the reaction of O\(^{(^1D)}\) and \( H_2O \)) while the reaction between \( O_3 \) and OH is comparable during the convective period. The lowest contribution to \( O_3 \) loss, \( O_3 + HO_2 \rightarrow OH + 2O_2 \), is reduced during the convection because of the production of LNO, which captures the HO\(_2\) reacting with \( O_3 \). Note that although the increase of total IRR induced by LNO\(_x\) can reach \( 1.36 \times 10^7 \) molec. cm\(^{-3}\) s\(^{-1}\) and \( 2.60 \times 10^6 \) molec. cm\(^{-3}\) s\(^{-1}\) in the low layer and high layer over these three regions, respectively, the net \( O_3 \) production actually decreases in the high layers (Fig. R1a–c) due to the combination of dynamic transport and chemical production related to LNO\(_x\).

**Relation between lightning and TROPOMI products**

Figure R4 shows that the AMF changes are mostly controlled by the LNO\(_x\) in the UT layer where the detection sensitivity is high (Beirle et al., 2009; Laughner and Cohen, 2017) and the LNO\(_x\) production reaches the peak (Fig. R2) ... 

... The clouds are higher than 400 hPa \( (P_{cloud} < 400 \text{ hPa}) \) and \( f_{effNO_2} \) is larger than 0.6 over fresh lightning pixels, but both aged lightning and downwind of fresh lightning areas have clouds lower than 400 hPa. This coincides with the mean cloud pressures in Fig. R2 and explains why UT \( \Delta AMF_{top} > 20 \% \) exits in Fig. R4b\(_i\) and b\(_{iii}\), indicating the possibility of LNO\(_x\) estimations over the aged lightning regions (Sect. 6.2). ...

... Besides, considering the region-specific LNO\(_x\) effects on AMFs, we need to include the representation of LNO\(_2\) in the TROPOMI NO\(_2\) retrievals better, especially outflow regions. The comparisons (Fig. R2) between the TROPOMI standard NO\(_2\) profiles from TM5-MP and WRF-Chem also illustrate the importance of LNO\(_x\), resolved convection transport, and emissions. Aircraft observations of NO and NO\(_2\) will be useful to determine the exact roles (Laughner and Cohen, 2017).

(2) I find that giving the contributions of dynamic and chemical effects on \( O_3 \) as percentages is confusing (abstract, text and conclusions) when the percentages are greater than 100 and the effects have opposite signs. For example, to summarize the life cycles of both cases, it would be clearer to say that the chemistry increases \( O_3 \) in both cases and that the magnitude of the effect is 5–10 times the magnitude of dynamic effects (rather than using the > 87% figure).

Yes, the percentage changes are confusing. We have modified them according to your advice.

**Abstract**

... During the whole convection life cycle, the UT \( O_3 \) production is driven by the chemistry (5–10 times the magnitude of dynamic contribution) and reduced by the LNO\(_x\) (–40 %).

**Convection impacts**

... While the dynamic processes play an important role in the \( O_3 \) production, the positive chemistry contribution cannot be neglected in both cases and leads to the net increase in UT \( O_3 \) during the convective period of 2020 case. Specifically, the chemistry increases \( O_3 \) in both cases and the magnitude of the effect is 5–10 times that of dynamic effects. This demonstrates the dominant chemistry role in the overall effects of convection.

**Conclusions**
Figure R1. (a–c) Changes in O₃ profiles due to LNOₓ at TROPOMI overpass time in three regions (fresh lightning region, downwind of fresh lightning, and aged lightning area) as defined in Fig. 7. (d–f) Time series of the mean integrated reaction rate (IRR) between 800 hPa and 500 hPa. The legend shows detailed species and reactions. The Total IRR is the O₃ loss IRR subtracted from the O₃ production IRR (red and orange lines). The solid line shows the IRR with LNO (500 mol/flash) while the dashed line is without LNO. (g–i) Same as (d–f) but between 500 hPa and 200 hPa.

... The detailed analysis of integrated physical rates shows that the dynamic processes dominate the UT O₃ decrease during the convective stage of both cases. However, in the convection life cycle, the contribution of chemistry reactions to the UT O₃ production is 5–10 times that of dynamics.

(3) A substantial part of UT NO₂ seen in the 2020 event is likely not produced by the flashes counted in the region in the hour(s) immediately prior to overpass. As seen in Fig. 5a, b, increased SCD_{tropNO₂} is visible in regions where the cloud pressures are higher and cloud fractions are lower. This is mentioned in lines 210–215 on page 12 (the relevance of Fig. S5 to this should also be made clearer). Some estimate of ambient NO₂ is needed so that it can be subtracted as a tropospheric background before the LNOₓ is computed. Studies have shown backgrounds can be substantial (e.g. Allen et al. 2019; Bucsela et al. 2019). A related issue is the relatively small estimate of 10% for the error introduced by the stratosphere (Allen et al.,...
Figure R2. Profiles with different lightning NO productions at TROPOMI overpass time over three regions (fresh lightning, downwind of fresh lightning, and aged lightning). (a–c) The NO$_2$ profiles compared with the official TM5 a priori NO$_2$ profile. (d–f) The lightning NO$_2$ and NO$_x$ profiles. The blue dashed line is the cloud optical pressure detected by TROPOMI.

This error assumed a tropospheric background subtraction that partially cancels stratospheric errors. Without this subtraction, the error would be larger.

1. Thanks, we have clarified the relevance of these figures for the ambient NO$_2$.
2. Note that the ambient NO$_2$ has been considered in the numerator of AMF$_{LNO_x}$:

\[
AMF_{LNO_x} = \frac{(1 - f_{effNO_2}) \int_{p_{surf}}^{p_{tp}} w_{clear}(p) NO_2(p) \, dp + f_{effNO_2} \int_{p_{cloud}}^{p_{tp}} w_{cloudy}(p) NO_2(p) \, dp}{\int_{p_{surf}}^{p_{tp}} LNO_x(p) \, dp} \tag{R2}
\]

This is different from that of Pickering et al. (2016), Allen et al. (2019), and Bucsela et al. (2019). We have added the comparison in Sect. 2.3 (TROPOMI Data).

3. For the stratospheric errors, we have estimated the uncertainty as 9% by applying a bias of $\pm 10^{14}$ molec. cm$^2$ (van Geffen et al., 2021). As mentioned in Bucsela et al. (2019), if they do not consider the background subtraction, “the stratospheric bias would have a >90% effect on PE”. Therefore, the low uncertainty (9%) related to the stratospheric vertical column indicates that our AMF$_{LNO_x}$ works well.

Relation between lightning and TROPOMI products

... Either the inadequate flash or weak convection could lead to a smaller SCD$_{tropNO_2}$ over pixels with $f_{effNO_2} \approx 1$ because the TROPOMI can only see the LNO$_2$ above the clouds. In other words, the polluted NO$_2$ below the broken or thinner clouds is partially exposed if $f_{effNO_2} < 1$. The sensitivity tests of
the WRF-Chem a priori SCD$_{\text{tropNO}_2}$ can help explain this phenomenon clearly (Fig. S5). The pixels of high SCD$_{\text{tropNO}_2}$ with low cloud fraction belong to background NO$_2$ pollution (Fig. S5a and e), but the SCD$_{\text{tropNO}_2}$ increased by UT LNO$_2$ is still visible compared with the lower SCD$_{\text{tropNO}_2}$ without LNO$_2$ (Fig. S5b–d and f–h).

**TROPOMI data**

... In comparison with this study, Pickering et al. (2016), Allen et al. (2019), Bucsela et al. (2019), and Allen et al. (2021) defined another AMF$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ to convert SCD$_{\text{tropNO}_2}$ to the tropospheric NO$_x$ vertical column density (VCD$_{\text{NO}_x}$). Then, their VCD$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ can be calculated as 1) the slope of the regression between VCD$_{\text{NO}_x}$ and flashes or 2) the VCD$_{\text{NO}_x}$ subtracted by a tropospheric NO$_2$ background. Because our AMF$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ converts the SCD$_{\text{tropNO}_2}$ to VCD$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ directly, the additional estimation of background NO$_2$ is not needed for calculating LNO$_x$ PE in Sect. 6.2.

**Estimations of LNO$_x$**

... Following Allen et al. (2019) and Zhang et al. (2020), the uncertainty of LNO$_x$ is determined by LNO$_x$ lifetime, lightning DE, NO/NO$_2$ ratio, LNO profile, and other sources (summarized in Table R2). The lifetime ($\tau$) of NO$_2$ is replaced by 2 and 6 hours to evaluate the uncertainty as 27 % while another uncertainty is also 27 % related to lightning DE by changing the ratio of IC to CG to 2:1 and 4:1. The uncertainty caused by modeled NO/NO$_2$ ratios is assumed to be 30 % based on Allen et al. (2019) and the uncertainty related to LNO profile is 26 % by using the a priori NO$_2$ profile with 330 and 700 mol NO per flash. The uncertainty associated with the stratospheric vertical column is considered as 7 % by applying a bias of $\pm 10^{14}$ molec. cm$^2$ (van Geffen et al., 2021). The uncertainty caused by other possible error sources including systematic errors in slant columns, optical cloud pressure, and NO$_2$ redistributed by convection is difficult to quantify and assumed as 10 % following Allen et al. (2021). Assuming no correlation between errors, the total uncertainty (56 %) is estimated as the square root of the sum of the squares of all individual uncertainties. As a result, the LNO$_x$ PE is $60 \pm 33$ mol NO$_x$ per flash. It is less than that of our previous work ($90 \pm 50$ mol NO$_x$ per flash) over the continental United States (Zhang et al., 2020) and at the lower end of $120 \pm 65$ mol NO$_x$ per flash obtained in Allen et al. (2021). Thus, more studies over China are necessary for the estimation of region-dependent LNO$_x$ PEs.

**Table R2**. Uncertainties for the estimation of LNO$_x$ production efficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Uncertainty (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LNO$_x$ lifetime</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning detection efficiency</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO/NO$_2$ ratio</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNO profile</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratospheric vertical column</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>56 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Fig. 6 a$_{ii}$ — c$_{ii}$ and a$_{iv}$ — c$_{iv}$ show a decrease in AMF$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ when LNO$_x$ is enhanced at higher altitudes, in contrast to the behavior of AMF$_{\text{trop}}$, which is consistent with Fig. 7. Please include some words qualitatively discussing the behavior of AMF$_{\text{LNO}_x}$.

*Added.*
While the AMF$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ decreases by 5%–40% for both cases, the changes of AMF$_{\text{trop}}$ (ΔAMF$_{\text{trop}}$) are regionally specific and can be classified by the lightning activity: fresh lightning (MT ΔAMF$_{\text{trop}}$ < −20%), downwind of fresh lightning (MT ΔAMF$_{\text{trop}}$ > 20%), and aged lightning (UT ΔAMF$_{\text{trop}}$ > 20%).

(5) In Figure 5f, why wasn’t the northern part of the region included in the LNO$_x$ analysis (section 5.2)? There appear to be adequate flashes there, along with LNO$_x$ and a high cloud fraction. The southern/southeastern regions include areas of low cloud fraction that could potentially contaminate the measurements with anthropogenic NO$_2$. Also, if winds are from the WNW, shouldn’t the flash-counting window be displaced WNW of the LNO$_x$ window?

We had decided to include both parts in the analysis at the first time. However, there are many missing data in the northern convection. As replied in (3), the anthropogenic NO$_2$ has been included in the retrieval algorithm, which has also been applied in Zhang et al. (2020). We have fixed a bug of deriving the VCD$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ and modified the selected region with clearer statements. The figure has been re-plotted and the LNO$_x$ PE is estimated as 60 ± 33 mol NO$_x$ per flash.

As the dissipated convection produced enough lightning and the UT winds within the storm were blowing from the west-northwest to east-southeast (Fig. R3a), the pattern of VCD$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ can still be clearly identified (dashed rectangle in Fig. R3). Fortunately, there is a low VCD$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ strip separating the northern and southern convection. With the careful selection, the LNO$_x$ PE is estimated as 60 mol NO$_x$ per flash. Although there are a few lightning flashes related to the VCD$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ is outside of the region selection, it only affects the LNO$_x$ PE by ≈ 2 mol, which is within the uncertainty discussed below.

**Figure R3.** The background is the distribution of LNO$_x$ vertical column densities (VCD$_{\text{LNO}_x}$). The white rectangles are manually selected regions for the LNO$_x$ PE estimation. The overlayed wind arrows in (a) are the 500 hPa horizontal wind simulated by WRF-Chem. The lightning dots in (b) and (c) are the flashes whose color depends on the occurring time relative to the TROPOMI overpass time.
Specific comments and technical corrections

1) Page 2, line 49: "We apply new a priori NO2..."

Thanks, fixed.

We apply **new a priori** NO\(_2\) profiles into the retrieval algorithm to explore the sensitivity of AMFs to LNO\(_x\).

2) Page 3, line 57: "...near the airmass convection that developed on 25..."

Fixed.

Three Institute of Atmospheric Physics (IAP) ozonesondes had been launched near the airmass convection that developed on 25 July 2019.

3) Page 3, line 64: "...the observed difference of more than 65%."

Fixed.

therefore the daily variation cannot explain the observed difference of more than 65 %.

4) Page 5, line 84: "...with a constant IC/CG ratio of 3:1 based on Wu et al..."

Fixed.

Because the IC DE of all these lightning data is low in China, we conservatively used the merged CG data with a constant IC/CG ratio of 3:1 based on ...

5) Page 5, lines 81 – 85: Please add some detail on how the 3 datasets were merged. Was CNDLN used to estimate a DE for ENTLN and WWLLN?

Added.

The detection efficiency (DE) of cloud-to-ground (CG) flashes is about 90 % for the CNLDN data in Jiangsu province (Li et al., 2017) while ENTLN and WWLLN detect both intro-cloud (IC) and CG flashes with specific detection frequency (1 Hz–12 MHz for ENTLN and 3–30 kHz for WWLLN). In the ENTLN data, groups of pulses are classified as a flash if they are within 700 ms and 10 km. Both strokes and lightning flashes composed of one or more strokes are included in the preprocessed data obtained from the ENTLN. The detailed processing algorithm of the WWLLN is given by Rodger et al. (2004). The WWLLN strokes and pulses are combined with ENTLN into one dataset (ENGLN) within 10 km and 0.7 s as mentioned in Virts and Goodman (2020). **To increase the lightning data coverage in our study, the CG flashes of ENGLN and CNLDN datasets are combined using spatial and temporal clustering criteria of 10 km and 0.5 s (Zhao et al., 2020). Although CG detection efficiency of ENGLN is not known for this region due to a lack of validation data, merging these three datasets should provide a sufficiently high CG flash detection efficiency for this analysis. Because the IC DE of all these lightning data is low in China, we conservatively use the merged CG data with a constant IC/CG ratio of 3:1 based on Wu et al. (2016) and Bandholnopparat et al. (2020). IC data will become more accurate if more Chinese total lightning networks, such as Beijing Lightning Network (BLNET; Srivastava et al., 2017), are available.**
6) Page 6, line 105: Please add a similar equation for AMF_{trop}, since it is used in section 5.1.

Added.

We replaced the tropospheric AMF (AMF_{trop}) with a new AMF called AMF for LNO_x (AMF_{LNO_x}) to derive the tropospheric LNO_x vertical column density (VCD_{LNO_x}). The concept of AMF_{LNO_x} inherits from the AMF_{trop} derived by a function of several parameters (solar zenith angle, viewing zenith angle, relative azimuth angle, surface albedo, surface pressure, cloud fraction, cloud height, and a priori trace gas profile). Briefly, the numerator is the modeled tropospheric NO_2 slant column density (SCD_{tropNO_2}) and the denominator is the modeled VCD (VCD_{NO_2} or VCD_{LNO_x}). In detail, these two AMFs can be calculated as:

\[
AMF_{Trop} = \frac{(1 - f_{effNO_2}) \int_{p_{surf}}^{p_t} w_{clear}(p) NO_2(p) dp + f_{effNO_2} \int_{p_{cloud}}^{p_t} w_{cloudy}(p) NO_2(p) dp}{\int_{p_{surf}}^{p_t} NO_2(p) dp}
\]

\[
AMF_{LNO_x} = \frac{(1 - f_{effNO_2}) \int_{p_{surf}}^{p_t} w_{clear}(p) NO_2(p) dp + f_{effNO_2} \int_{p_{cloud}}^{p_t} w_{cloudy}(p) NO_2(p) dp}{\int_{p_{surf}}^{p_t} LNO_x(p) dp}
\]

7) Page 7, line 161: "The squall line on 1 September, 2020 was born..."

Sorry for the wrong date. Fixed.

The squall line on 1 **September, 2020** was born in the...

8) Page 10, Fig. 4 caption: "The vertical distributions of the O_3 net production rate and tendency..."

Fixed.

The vertical distributions of the O_3 **net production rate and tendency** due to ...

9) Page 10, line 198: Regarding "...less significant (< 1%)..." From Table 1, I estimate that for the 2020 case, changes in chemistry affect net O3 production by 0.3% and \(\approx 3\%\) during the life cycle and convective period, resp.

The changes are \((16.9-17.1)/17.1 = 1\%\) and \((31.9-32.0)/32.0 = 0.3\%\) for the convective period and life cycle, resp (Table R1).

The decreased chemistry contribution is less significant (\(\leq 1\%\)) for the 2020 case which has a smaller lightning density near the station.

10) P10, line 201: "...can certainly enhance the downwind ozone production on the scale of days..."

Fixed.

Note that the LNO_x can certainly enhance the downwind ozone production **on the scale of days** (Pickering et al., 1996; DeCaria et al., 2005).

11) Page 12, Fig. 5 caption: Please state white grid cells are for missing TROPOMI data (no2_scd_flag > 0 ?).

We have modified the caption and added the definition of no2_scd_flag in the Appendix A.
**Fig caption**

... These white grid cells stand for missing TROPOMI data (no2_scd_flag ≠ 0), as defined in Appendix A.

**Appendix A: Flag definitions used in this study**

The no2_scd_flag is introduced to make usage of the NO\textsubscript{2} slant column (SCD) data easier, by gathering information from a few variables into one flag (Table R3). This flag can thus be used for filtering, though with care as it probably does not cover all possible situation. Here "δ" refers to the SCD error (in mol/m\textsuperscript{2}) and "pqf" stands for processing quality flag.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table R3</th>
<th>Definition of no2_scd_flag.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>no SCD value due to saturation limit exceeded, i.e. pqf=54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>SCD with $\delta &lt; 3.3 \times 10^{-5}$ &amp; no error reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCD with $\delta &lt; 3.3 \times 10^{-5}$ &amp; error reported: pqf=55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SCD with $\delta &lt; 3.3 \times 10^{-5}$ &amp; other error reported, e.g. pqf=41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SCD with $\delta \geq 3.3 \times 10^{-5}$ &amp; no error reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCD with $\delta \geq 3.3 \times 10^{-5}$ &amp; error reported: pqf=55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SCD with $\delta \geq 3.3 \times 10^{-5}$ &amp; other error reported, e.g. pqf=41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FillValue</td>
<td>no SCD due other error (prior to the Differential Optical Absorption Spectroscopy fit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) Page 13, lines 218-219: "... middle troposphere (MT, 800 hPa to 400 hPa), upper troposphere (UT 400 hPa to 150 hPa)...

Added the abbreviation of upper troposphere.

The changes in the retrieved AMFs are examined by replacing profiles in three tropospheric layers independently: middle troposphere (MT, 800 hPa to 400 hPa), upper troposphere (UT, 400 hPa to 150 hPa), and troposphere (surface to tropopause)

13) Page 13, line 220-221: "...Figure 6 shows that the AMF changes...". Also, Beirle et al. (2009) noted a decrease in sensitivity in the UT due to the NO2/NOx branching ratio.

Added.

Figure 7 shows that the AMF changes are mostly controlled by the LNO\textsubscript{x} in the UT layer where the detection sensitivity is high (Beirle et al., 2009; Laughner and Cohen, 2017) and the LNO\textsubscript{x} production reaches the peak (Fig. S6).

14) Page 13, line 226: "...UT ΔAMF\textsubscript{trop} > 20 % exists in Fig. 6bi and biii,"

Fixed.

This explains why UT ΔAMF\textsubscript{trop} > 20 % exits in Fig. 7bi and biii.

15) Page 14, Fig 6 caption:

"...is the AMF\textsubscript{trop} with 500 mol NO per flash relative to 0 mol NO per flash"

"...is the AMF\textsubscript{LNO\textsubscript{x}} with 700 mol NO per flash relative to 500 mol NO per flash"

Also, it would help to see the ovals overplotted on all figures for easier comparison.
Thanks for the suggestion. We have added ovals to the first and third row of Fig. R4, because the $\Delta \text{AMF}_{\text{LNO}_x}$ is mostly negative and the figure is cleaner than that full of ovals.

Figure R4. The percent differences of AMFs by replacing the a priori NO$_2$ profiles at three layers: middle troposphere (left), upper troposphere (middle), and troposphere (right). $\Delta \text{AMF}_{\text{trop}}$ is the comparison of the AMF$_{\text{trop}}$ with 500 mol NO per flash relative to 0 mol NO per flash. $\Delta \text{AMF}_{\text{LNO}_x}$ is the comparison of the AMF$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ with 700 mol NO per flash relative to 500 mol NO per flash. Three regions are annotated: fresh lightning (blue), downwind of fresh lightning (red), and aged lightning (green). Because of the quite large AMF$_{\text{LNO}_x}$ values in pixels with little lightning, $\Delta \text{AMF}_{\text{LNO}_x}$ is shown over pixels where $0 < \text{AMF}_{\text{LNO}_x} < 10$.

16) Page 15, Fig 7: Please label the x-axes in (b), (c) and (d).

Added (Fig. R5).
Figure R5. (a) The relationship between cloud pressure and $f_{\text{effNO}_2}$ for three regions defined in Fig. 7: fresh lightning region, downwind of fresh lightning, and aged lightning area. (b-d) The a priori $\text{SCD}_{\text{tropNO}_2}^{\text{LNO}_x}/\text{SCD}_{\text{tropNO}_2}^{\text{noLNO}_x}$ and a priori $\text{VCD}_{\text{tropNO}_2}^{\text{LNO}_x}/\text{VCD}_{\text{tropNO}_2}^{\text{noLNO}_x}$ of pixels in these three regions. The $\text{LNO}_x$ superscript indicates that the a priori variable is calculated with $\text{LNO}_x$ (500 mol NO per flash) and the no$\text{LNO}_x$ superscript is without $\text{LNO}_x$.

17) Figure S1, caption: "... WRF-Chem simulations for the 2019 and 2020 cases."

Fixed.

Domain and terrain height (m) of the WRF-Chem simulations for the 2019 and 2020 cases.

18) Figure S2: The times/dates in the legend of (a) are not correct

Sorry for the misleading. Because the time resolution of WACCM is 6 hours, the time shown in the legend (Fig. R6) is different from that of ozonesonde.

19) Figure S3, caption: "... in Fig. 2 for 25 July, 2019."

Fixed (Fig. R7).
Figure R6. (a) Regional mean (118.5°E – 119.5°E, 31.5°N – 32.5°N) preconvection (blue) and postconvection (orange) O₃ profiles from the 6-hour WACCM forecasts. (b) The percent difference of O₃ profiles in (a).

Figure R7. Vertical cross sections of (a) WRF-Chem simulated and (b) observed radar reflectivity fields along the transect lines (AB) in Fig. 2 for 25 July, 2019.