

[Interactive
Comment](#)

Interactive comment on “Hydrogen peroxide in the marine boundary layer over the southern Atlantic during the OOMPH cruise in March 2007” by H. Fischer et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 1 January 2015

Review of Fischer et al.

Summary

The authors present an analysis of H₂O₂ (HP) and CH₃OOH (MHP) during the OOMPH cruise in the S. Atlantic. They compare the results to model output and make inferences regarding the model representation of HP & MHP sinks.

Their chemical transport model has a tendency to underestimate the observed HP during the first part of the campaign, but not the second part, while overestimating MHP throughout. The authors argue that the model HP underestimate is unlikely to

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



reflect sources, and instead indicates that HP sinks in the model are too strong – and in particular dry deposition. A sensitivity simulation in which they impose a lower deposition velocity improves agreement for HP, while not affecting MHP much because of the lower solubility.

They point out that the MHP overestimate in the model could reflect a number of factors, including the collection efficiency, which was not quantified but estimated at 60%, as well as chemical reactions (i.e. $\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2 + \text{OH}$) that were not included in their baseline simulation.

The argument that the model H_2O_2 bias arises from dry deposition is plausible but far from definitive. In my opinion they need to do more quantitative analysis to justify this assessment. They state that the model accurately simulates HO_2 , and that therefore the discrepancy is unlikely due to misrepresentation of the H_2O_2 source. But specifically, how good is the agreement for HO_2 , and how does that error propagate onto the predicted H_2O_2 ? Measurements of HO_2 are themselves far from perfect, and in at least some FAGE measurements include an interference from some RO_2 . Is that an issue here? Once you consider both measurement and model uncertainty in terms of HO_2 , what is the resulting error bar imparted to the H_2O_2 predictions that is associated with the sources? Does the model prediction of H_2O_2 and CH_3OOH depend on NO being accurately simulated? Is it?

Are there any other HP sinks to be considered, such as uptake to aqueous aerosols, that could have an impact? What about aerosol uptake of HO_2 ?

Overall, the attribution of HP model bias to dry deposition relies too much on hand-waving. The paper needs a more quantitative consideration of the other budget terms, and a propagation of those uncertainties (or envelope of sensitivity runs) to the predicted HP. If the model-measurement discrepancy is larger than can reasonably be accommodated by those other terms, then it becomes reasonable to invoke dry deposition. It may well be that this is the case, but not enough has been done to establish

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

it.

It's hard to know what to make of the MHP analysis, since the authors don't seem to know how much to trust the measurements. The sampling efficiency of 60% was not measured but calculated based on a previous study, and MHP was assumed to be the dominant peroxide (the technique measures the sum). For this portion of the paper to be useful, we need a quantitative treatment of what the authors consider to be the uncertainties on the measured concentrations, and to see to what degree these are smaller than the model-measurement differences.

Specific comments:

30557, 22-26: "As shown by Hosaynali Beygi et al. (2011), EMAC reproduces observed HO₂ levels during the whole campaign and indicates similar levels for HO₂ and CH₃O₂, the precursors of CH₃OOH. Given that the precursor levels are simulated realistically by EMAC, it is very unlikely that an underestimation of the peroxide production is responsible for the H₂O₂ underestimation during the first half of the campaign."

Perhaps I missed it, but I don't see in the Hosaynali Beygi paper where they directly evaluate the EMAC simulation of HO₂. Same goes for OH, which is referred to later ("the model also reproduces OH concentrations"). There is an evaluation of a constrained box model (their Fig 9), but that is not the same thing.

Fig 4, why do the model H₂O₂ concentrations become negative early on March 14?

Since the second channel is MHP + all other peroxides, wouldn't it make more sense to compare with the same model quantity rather than just the model MHP?

30557, 18: "hence the main problem seems to be that the model underestimates H₂O₂ during the early phase of the campaign" . . . not sure I follow. Isn't the fact that CH₃OOH is overestimated throughout also a problem?

30551, 25-27: doesn't catalase react to some degree with MHP also? Please provide some quantitative information on how specific this is.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



30552, 15: does the 25 ppt detection limit apply to MHP as well as H₂O₂?

30555, 18: “measured and observed H₂O₂” . . . should be “measured and modeled”, I guess

30557, 13 and Fig 6: please discuss what we learn from the ratio of the two that wasn't already apparent from the plots of the species individually

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 30547, 2014.

ACPD

14, C10637–C10640,
2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C10640

