Investigation of ship-plume chemistry using a newly-developed photochemical ship-plume model
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Abstract

A photochemical ship-plume model, which can consider the ship-plume dynamics and ship-plume chemistry, simultaneously, was developed to gain a better understanding of atmospheric impact of ship emissions. The model performance was then evaluated by a comparison with the observation data measured on a NOAA WP-3D flight during the Intercontinental Transport and Chemical Transformation 2002 (ITCT 2K2) airborne field campaign. The simulation conditions and parameters, such as meteorological conditions, emission rates, and background gas and particulate species concentrations, were obtained directly and/or inferred indirectly from the ITCT 2K2 observation data. The model-predicted concentrations showed good agreement with the observed concentrations of five ambient species (NO\textsubscript{x}, NO\textsubscript{y}, O\textsubscript{3}, HNO\textsubscript{3}, and H\textsubscript{2}SO\textsubscript{4}) at the eight plume transects by the WP-3D flight with strong correlations around the 1:1 line (0.66\leq R \leq 0.85). In addition, a set of tests were carried out to approximate the magnitude of the reaction probability of HNO\textsubscript{3} onto sea-salt particles in the model-observation comparison framework. These results suggest that the reaction probability of HNO\textsubscript{3} onto sea-salt particles may be in the order of 10^{-3} or smaller. The equivalent NO\textsubscript{x} lifetime throughout the “entire” plume was also estimated from ship-plume chemistry modeling. The NO\textsubscript{x} lifetimes estimated throughout the “entire ship plume” was 3.36 h. The short NO\textsubscript{x} lifetime over the entire ship plume clearly shows that the ship-plume chemistry shortens the NO\textsubscript{x} lifetime considerably. Therefore, the ship-plume chemistry model should be used to model the changes in ship-plume chemical compositions and better evaluate the atmospheric impact of ocean-going ship emissions.

1 Introduction

Ocean-going ship emissions are considered important contributors to climate change and atmospheric environmental pollution in the marine boundary layer (MBL). This importance has been recognized since the late 1990s (Corbett and Fishbeck, 1997;
Capaldo et al., 1999; Corbett et al., 1999; Lawrence and Crutzen, 1999). Corbett and Fishbeck (1997) and Corbett et al. (1999) first estimated the annual global emission fluxes of SO$_2$ and NO$_x$ from ocean-going ships. They estimated that global NO$_x$ and SO$_2$ emission fluxes in 1993 were 10.12 (Tg yr$^{-1}$) and 8.48 (Tg yr$^{-1}$), respectively. Since then, the NO$_x$ and SO$_2$ emission fluxes from ocean-going ships have been further updated and re-evaluated using more sophisticated ship-emission estimation methodologies and updated fuel combustion data (Corbett and Koehler, 2003; Endresen et al., 2003; Beirle et al., 2004). For example, Beirle et al. (2004) estimated the NO$_x$ emission fluxes from ocean-going ships over the Indian Ocean, using the GOME-derived NO$_2$ vertical column density. Corbett and Koehler (2003) updated the global ship emission data using updated fuel consumption data for 2001. Based on Corbett and Koehler’s estimation (2003), NO$_x$ and SO$_2$ emissions contribute approximately $\sim$21% and $\sim$7% of the total global NO$_x$ and SO$_2$ emissions from fuel combustion. Although ship SO$_2$ emissions comprise $\sim$7% of the global SO$_2$ emissions, it is a dominant source of SO$_2$ within the MBL, and may produce significant amounts of non-sea-salt (nss) sulfate (Capaldo et al., 1999). The increased amount of nss-sulfate can further enhance the production of cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) within the remote MBL, resulting in a negative global radiative forcing of $\sim$–0.11 Wm$^{-2}$ (Capaldo et al., 1999; Phinney et al., 2009). Lawrence and Crutzen (1999) examined the perturbation effects of ocean-going ship-emitted NO$_x$ on the oxidation cycles in the ship-going MBL. They found from a 3-D Eulerian Chemistry-Transport modeling (CTM) study that the ozone and OH radical concentrations were elevated by a factor of $\sim$2 and $\sim$5, respectively, when the ocean-going ship emissions were taken into account. However, their predictions overestimated the NO$_x$, O$_3$, and OH levels within the remote MBL (Kasibhatla et al., 2000; Davis et al., 2001; Song et al., 2003a; von Glasow et al., 2003). Several field observations also showed elevations of the ozone and OH levels in the MLB affected by ocean-going ship emissions (e.g., Davis et al., 2001; Chen et al., 2005). More recently, Endersen et al. (2003) estimated the global net radiative forcing from ship emissions using a global CTM (Oslo CTM2), and the net radiative forcing ranged from 0.01 to
0.02 \((\text{Wm}^{-2})\) but with considerable uncertainty. On the other hand, the emissions of particulate species from ocean-going ships can also affect the radiative forcing over ocean areas, while particles playing the important role of cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) in the formation of marine stratiform clouds (Radke et al., 1989; Twomey, 1997; Ferek et al., 1998; Russell et al., 1999; Hudson et al., 2000), which are often called “ship tracks”. Overall, NO\textsubscript{x}, SO\textsubscript{2}, and particle emissions from ocean-going ships significantly affect the atmospheric oxidation cycles within the MBL and global radiation budget, even though there is still large uncertainty in their quantitative estimations.

As mentioned above, it was reported that the use of the coarse-grid 3-D CTMs in treating point-source emissions, such as ships, could lead to over-predictions in the NO\textsubscript{x}, O\textsubscript{3} and OH levels (Kasibhatla et al., 2000; Davis et al., 2001; Song et al., 2003a; von Glasow et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2005), by skipping the nonlinear ship-plume chemistry. For example, Song et al. (2003a) focused on in-plume chemical transformations using a plume-chemistry model. Their study demonstrated the importance of taking the ship-plume chemistry into account when determining the NO\textsubscript{x}, O\textsubscript{3}, and OH concentrations. von Glasow et al. (2003) also suggested that the absence of nonlinear ship-plume chemistry can result in over-predictions in the NO\textsubscript{x}, O\textsubscript{3}, and OH levels. However, these studies have limitations in that the model investigations were carried out based on a simple 0-dimensional Lagrangian photochemical box model without any model validation with observations. Although Chen et al. (2005) examined the ship-plume chemistry with plume observation data from the ITCT 2K2 aircraft campaign and the predicted atmospheric concentrations from photo-stationary state modeling, their study may also have a limitation in that the model used in their study was not a full ship-plume chemistry model. Rather, it was a general photo-stationary state model constrained by the observed atmospheric species concentrations. Therefore, their model could not predict the concentrations over the “entire volume” of the ship plume.

The development of the “entire volume” ship-plume model is important because the ship-plume photo-chemistry is highly non-linear, not only “along the plume-advecting
direction” (x-direction), but also “in the plume-dispersing direction” (y- and z-directions). In addition, the distributions of the ship-plume species concentrations in the y- and z-directions are frequently “non-Gaussian”, particularly for secondarily-formed species, such as ozone and OH. The present study developed a ship-plume chemistry model that can explicitly consider the “non-linear” and “non-Gaussian” characteristics of chemical evolution of the “entire” ship plume (Sect. 2). The data from the developed ship-plume photochemistry model was compared with aircraft observation data from the ITCT 2K2 campaign (Sect. 3). Section 4 evaluates the magnitude of the reaction probability of HNO₃ onto sea-salt particles ($\gamma_{HNO_3,ss}$), which is a currently “hotly-debated issue”. Subsequently, using the developed ship-plume photochemistry model, NOx chemical lifetimes ($\tau_{NOx}^{chem}$) were estimated over the “entire” ship plumes (Sect. 5). The estimation of $\tau_{NOx}^{chem}$ is important, for example when the NOx emission fluxes from ships are estimated from the satellite-retrieved NO2 columns over the ship-going oceans, as conducted by Beirle et al. (2004).

2 Model development

2.1 Ship-plume chemistry

In this study, we developed UBoM 2K8 model (Utility photochemical Box Model 2K8). Since the UBoM 2K8 model was first developed, it has been applied to three different types of atmospheric chemistry modeling study: (i) Lagrangian backward/forward trajectory photochemical modeling (Song et al., 2007), (ii) Eulerian photochemical box modeling, and (iii) ship-plume chemistry modeling (Song et al., 2003a, b). Although it has been operated in the three different modes, the three modes share the same atmospheric photochemical components, heterogeneous parameterizations and aerosol chemistry of the UBoM 2K8 model.

The photochemical components of the UBoM 2K8 model are the same as those used in previous studies (e.g., Crawford et al., 1999; Song et al., 2003a, b, 2007). The cur-
rent model mechanism includes 71 H$_x$O$_y$-N$_x$O$_y$-CH$_4$ related reactions and 184 NMHC reactions. The former chemistry is based on Lurmann et al.’s (1986) condensed mechanism with some major modifications. These include appropriately updated rate coefficients as well as additional NO$_x$ and organic peroxide reactions (e.g., Atkinson et al., 1997; DeMore et al., 1997; Crawford et al., 1999). In addition to these gas-phase photochemical reactions, several gas/aqueous-phase sulfur reactions/equilibria were also included to examine the chemical fates of the various sulfur species in the atmosphere (Song et al., 2003b). The gas-particle interactions between nitrate precursor species (N$_2$O$_5$, NO$_3$, and HNO$_3$) and aerosols were considered using pseudo-first order kinetics:

$$\frac{d[C_i]}{dt} = -k_{mt,i}[C_i]$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $[C_i]$ is the concentration of gas-phase species “$i$”, and $k_{mt,i}$ is the overall mass transfer coefficient (s$^{-1}$). The Schwartz formula to calculate $k_{mt,i}$ for the precursor species of nitrate (Schwartz, 1986) was used:

$$k_{mt,i} = \frac{\gamma_i S \bar{v}_i}{4}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\gamma_i$ represents the reaction probability (or uptake coefficient) of the precursor species “$i$”, $S$ is the aerosol surface density (cm$^2$ cm$^{-3}$), and $\bar{v}_i$ is the molecular mean velocity (cm s$^{-1}$) of the precursor species “$i$”. In particular, using Eqs. (1) and (2), a parameterization for HNO$_3$ partitioning onto atmospheric aerosols was added to the UBoM 2K8 model, which had not been considered explicitly in previous studies (Song et al., 2003a, b; Chen et al., 2005; Song et al., 2007).

In order to consider the interactions between sulfate precursor species (SO$_2$ and H$_2$SO$_4$) and sea-salt particles, the following parameterization was used to account for the precursor accommodation and aqueous-phase oxidation reactions of SO$_2$ in sea-
salt particles (Brasseur et al., 1999; Mari et al., 1999; Song et al., 2003b):

\[
\frac{1}{k_{t,SO_2}} = \frac{1}{k_{mt,SO_2}} + \frac{1}{k_{O_3} + k_{H_2O_2}}
\]  

(3)

where \(k_{t,SO_2}\) represents the total (or net) \(SO_2\) scavenging and oxidation loss coefficient (s\(^{-1}\)); and \(k_{O_3}\) and \(k_{H_2O_2}\) denote the overall oxidation rate coefficients (s\(^{-1}\)) by aqueous \(O_3\) and \(H_2O_2\), respectively. For the condensation of \(SO_2\) and \(H_2SO_4\), \(k_{mt,i}\) and \(\gamma_i\) are replaced by \(k_{t,i}\) and \(\alpha_i\) (mass accommodation coefficient) in Eqs. (1) and (2), respectively. More details on the parameterizations can be found in the report by Song et al. (2003b).

The photolysis rate coefficients used are those based on a DISORT 4-stream implementation of the NCAR Tropospheric Ultraviolet-Visible (TUV) radiative code with an updated \(O(1D)\) quantum yield (Talukdar et al., 1997). The solutions to the ordinary differential equations that describe the time-dependent variations in atmospheric species concentrations were achieved using the Gear ODE (Ordinary Differential Equation) solver.

### 2.2 Ship-plume dynamics

The fundamentals of the plume transport and turbulent dispersion are based on Hanna et al. (1985)’s Offshore and Coastal Dispersion (OCD) algorithm. The plume centerline concentration of species “i” can be expressed as follows:

\[
\frac{C_i}{Q_i} = \frac{1}{\pi u_r \sigma_y \sigma_z}
\]  

(4)

where \(Q_i\) is the emission rate (kg s\(^{-1}\)) of the primary pollutant species “i” from the ship, \(u_r\) is resulting wind speed, which is related to the relative motion of the ship and wind; and \(\sigma_y\) and \(\sigma_z\) represent the lateral and vertical turbulent dispersion parameters, respectively. Many meteorological variables are necessary to correctly determine \(\sigma_y\) and
σ_z, such as the standard deviations for the lateral and vertical fluctuation parameters, friction velocity (u_*) and surface roughness length (z_o). Previously, Song et al. (2003a) derived some useful expressions for σ_y and σ_z as a function of the downwind distances (x) and atmospheric stability classes. These formulas (or methodology) were applied to the current study with some extensions. The formulas used in this study are shown in Table 1.

As mentioned previously, the basic concept of the newly-developed ship-plume photochemical model is the same as that reported by Song et al. (2003a, b). Figure 1a shows a schematic diagram of the dynamic plume development due to turbulent dispersion. In the course of plume development, the plume is dispersed elliptically at the y-z plane, as shown in Fig. 1a. In case that the boundary layer is capped by the “inversion height” (or “mixing height”; denoted as h in the z-direction), it was assumed that the plumes cannot be dispersed above the mixing height. At this point, σ_z is not allowed to expand beyond approximately 0.8 h. Therefore, in this case, dispersion takes place only in the y-direction (refer to Fig. 1b). Based on this, the dilution factors for species “i” (D_{i,k}) were defined using the following equations (Song et al., 2003a):

\[
D_{i,k} = C_{i,k+1} = \frac{(\sigma_y \sigma_z)_k}{(\sigma_y \sigma_z)_{k+1}}, \text{ if } \sigma_z \leq 0.8 \text{ } h
\]  

(5)

\[
D_{i,k} = \frac{C_{i,k+1}}{C_{i,k}} = \frac{(\sigma_y)_k}{(\sigma_y)_{k+1}}, \text{ if } \sigma_z > 0.8 \text{ } h
\]  

(6)

where C_{i,k} and C_{i,k+1} denote the concentration of species “i” at the time steps k and k+1, respectively (see Fig. 1a and b). The value of D_{i,k} is always between 0 and 1. This dilution factor can be understood as a ratio of the elliptical plume areas at the y-z plane during Δt. Therefore, the change in concentration of species “i” (ΔC^D_i) due to atmospheric turbulent dispersion (or dilution) can be expressed by:

\[
\Delta C^D_i = C_{i,k+1} - C_{i,k} = (D_{i,k} - 1) \text{ } C_{i,k} + (1 - D_{i,k}) \text{ } C_{i,b}
\]  

(7)
Here, $C_{i,b}$ indicates the background (out-plume) concentration of species “$i$”.

In order to predict the plume concentrations throughout the entire ship plume, it was assumed that the concentrations of primary pollutants, such as NO$_x$ and SO$_2$, are distributed along the y-z plane, with Gaussian shapes (refer to Fig. 1a and b):

$$\xi(\chi, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma(t)} \exp\left[\frac{-\chi^2}{2\sigma(t)^2}\right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $\xi(\chi, t)$ represents the Gaussian function at plume-travel time “$t$” and the location $\chi$, $\chi$ indicates the distance (deviation) from the plume center (i.e., $y=0$ and $z=0$) on the y and/or z planes, $\sigma(t)$ denotes the standard deviation (or dispersion parameter) at plume-travel time “$t$”, which was determined by the formulas in Table 1. Hence, the primary pollutant distributions can be calculated from Eqs. (9) and (10):

$$F_c(\chi, t) = \exp\left[\frac{-\chi^2}{2\sigma(t)^2}\right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$C_i(\chi, t) = C_{i,cl}F_c(\chi, t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

where $F_c(\chi, t)$ is the frequency function, $C_i(\chi, t)$ is the concentration of the primary pollutant $i$ (such as NO$_x$ or SO$_2$) in a given location $\chi$ at plume-travel time $t$, and $C_{i,cl}$ is the centerline concentration of species $i$ at plume-travel time $t$. From Eqs. (9) and (10), the peak (or centerline) concentrations of NO$_x$ and SO$_2$ occur at $\chi=0$. The plume concentrations were calculated over the “entire” ship plume by running the multiple Lagrangian plume boxes along the different $\sigma$ lines, with 0.25$\sigma$ increments, as shown briefly in Fig. 1c. At the Lagrangian plume runs, the ship-plume chemistry is driven primarily by the primary pollutant concentrations, which have Gaussian shapes. The levels of the secondary pollutants (e.g., ozone, HNO$_3$, PAN, NO$_3$, N$_2$O$_5$, and OH) were determined by both the ship-plume photochemistry and ship-plume dynamics, as described previously. The results from the multiple Lagrangian plume runs were smoothed on the y and z planes at each time step. The model calculations were then
forwarded toward the next calculation time step (i.e., time marching), until the ship plume had been diluted completely.

This modeling study can be distinguished from the work by Chen et al. (2005): (i) the model-predicted species concentrations in this study were not the solutions from a photo-stationary state approximation (i.e., $dc/dt=0$), and (ii) the model calculations were not made with any constraint with the observation data. Photo-stationary state approximations with the constraints of the observation data can produce satisfactory estimates for short-lived species at the locations where the observation data is available. However, it cannot provide adequate solutions for the long-lived and short-lived species concentrations at other ship-plume locations where the observation data are unavailable. In addition, constraining the photo-stationary state modeling with simultaneously observed plume concentrations would be difficult because the observation data for atmospheric species measured by aircraft campaign may have different measurement times and resolutions inside the ship plume. Therefore, in this study, a full ship-plume chemistry modeling was carried out with full time integration, starting with the initial and background chemical and meteorological conditions and ship emission rate, as performed by Karamchandani et al. (2000) for a study of the Cumberland power plant plume during the Southern Oxidant Study (SOS).

### 3 Model evaluations

#### 3.1 Observations from ITCT 2K2

The simulation performance of the newly-developed photochemical ship-plume model was evaluated by carrying out a comparison study using the observation data from the ITCT 2K2 airborne field campaign. Among the ITCT 2K2 observation data, this study used the data from a ship-plume experiment conducted approximately noon on 8 May, 2002, by a NOAA WP-3D flight. Figure 2 shows the sampling trajectory of the NOAA WP-3D flight. As shown in Fig. 2, the NOAA WP-3D traversed the ship plume eight
times from transects A to H, (Chen et al., 2005). As also shown in Fig. 2, the NOAA WP-3D flight did not traverse the ship plume perpendicularly. The angle between the ship-plume travel and the WP-3D flight path was approximately 59°. The simulation conditions and parameters, such as the meteorological conditions, emission rates, and background gas and particulate species concentrations, were obtained directly and/or inferred indirectly from the ITCT 2K2 observation data. The wind velocity and direction were reported to be 9–11 (m s\(^{-1}\)) and SSE, respectively. The ship was heading WNW, and its speed was \(\sim5\) m s\(^{-1}\) (\(~9.7\) knots) (Chen et al., 2005). During the WP-3D flight experiment, the sky was found to be clear (see Table 2). Information on the sampling instruments is summarized in other publications (Brock et al., 2000, 2003; Nowak et al., 2004; Parrish et al., 2004). Therefore, they are not reported in this manuscript.

3.2 Determination of stability class and modeling conditions

As discussed in Sect. 2.2 and shown Table 1, the turbulent dispersion parameters, \(\sigma_y\) and \(\sigma_z\), are a strong function of the atmospheric stability. Therefore, two independent meteorological datasets, (i) meteorological data measured by the NOAA WP-3D flight and (ii) NCEP 6 hourly reanalysis-2 pressure-level data, were used to determine the stability classes of the MBL within which the NOAA WP-3D ship-plume measurements had been taken. The three rectangular points in Fig. 2 (I, II, and III), represent the locations where the NECP 6 hourly reanalysis-2 pressure-level data were obtained. Figure 3a and b shows the vertical temperature profiles obtained from the WP-3D flight observations and NCEP reanalysis data, respectively. Figure 3b shows the temperature profiles over the three locations (I, II, and III). The NCEP data obtained at 11:00 a.m. on 8 May, 2002 (when the WP-3D aircraft began to measure the plume composition), were applied to this analysis. Based on the two temperature profiles, the actual lapse rates of air temperature (\(\Gamma\); K km\(^{-1}\)) were derived from the sea surface to 800 m a.s.l. The \(\Gamma\) from the WP-3D aircraft observations ranged from \(-3.13\) (K km\(^{-1}\)) to \(-1.09\) (K km\(^{-1}\)), and the values of \(\Gamma\) from the NCEP reanalysis data were \(-0.92\) (K km\(^{-1}\)), \(-0.63\) (K km\(^{-1}\)), and \(-0.34\) (K km\(^{-1}\)) for locations I, II, and III, respectively.
The atmospheric stability classes were then determined by a comparison of the actual lapse rate ($\Gamma$) with the moisture adiabatic lapse rates ($\Gamma_s$). The values of $\Gamma_s$ were reported to be $\sim 4$ K km$^{-1}$ in warm and humid air masses (about 293 K) in the lower MBL and $\sim 5$ K km$^{-1}$ to 6–7 K km$^{-1}$ in the cold air (about 283 K) in the middle of the MBL (Gill, 1982; Holton, 1992). Based on the mean air temperatures of approximately 283 K and 286 K for the ITCT 2K2 data and the NCEP reanalysis data, respectively, it was decided to use $\Gamma_s = -5$ K km$^{-1}$ for the ITCT 2K2 data and $-4.5$ K km$^{-1}$ for the NCEP reanalysis data. From these comparisons (Fig. 3a and b), it was concluded that the most likely atmospheric stability within the MBL exists between moderately stable (E) and stable (F). Therefore, ship-plume photochemical modeling was carried out at these two atmospheric stability classes.

The concentrations of gas-phase primary and secondary pollutants, such as NO, NO$_2$, NO$_y$, O$_3$, CO, CO$_2$, NMHCs, SO$_2$, HNO$_3$, H$_2$SO$_4$, were obtained from the NOAA WP-3D observations. Again, detailed information on the instruments used in the flight measurements is discussed elsewhere (Brock et al., 2000, 2003; Nowak et al., 2004; Parrish et al., 2004), and is summarized at http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/csd/ITCT/2k2/P3instruments.shtml. The observed mean background concentrations of the gas-phase species outside the ship plume for NO$_x$, SO$_2$, O$_3$, CO, H$_2$SO$_4$, HNO$_3$, PAN, and C$_3$H$_8$ were $\sim 190$ pptv, 400 pptv, 40 ppbv, 138 ppbv, 0.4 pptv, 5 pptv, 135 pptv, and 370 pptv, respectively. The aerosol-related variables, such as number, size, and volume concentrations, were measured directly using a combination of an aerosol size spectrometer and white light-scattering methods. The chemical composition of particulate species was measured using a particle-into-liquid sampler coupled with an ion chromatograph (PILS-IC) (Weber et al., 2001; Orsini et al., 2003). Table 2 summarizes the background conditions.

In order to consider atmospheric heterogeneous processes, the values of the reaction probabilities ($\gamma_i$) for N$_2$O$_5$, NO$_3$, and HNO$_3$, mass accommodation coefficients ($\alpha_i$) for SO$_2$ and H$_2$SO$_4$, and aerosol pH, were obtained from previous reports (Song et al., 2003a, b), and are shown in Table 2. However, the reaction probability of HNO$_3$
\( \gamma_{HNO_3, ss} \) on sea-salt particles was assumed to be 10\(^{-3} \). This study tested the magnitude of \( \gamma_{HNO_3, ss} \). The details will be discussed in Sect. 4. As indicated previously by Chen et al. (2005), the averaged surface density (\( S \) in Eq. 2) of sea-salt particles in the ship plume was measured to be 90 \( \mu m^2 \ cm^{-3} \). Of a total of 120 \( \mu m^2 \ cm^{-3} \), the surface density of 30 \( \mu m^2 \ cm^{-3} \) was assumed to have originated from direct aerosol emissions from the ship. Therefore, these surface densities were used in Eqs. (1) and (2) to calculate the mass flux from the gas and particulate phases, respectively.

The emission rates were obtained directly from the observed emission factors to reduce the uncertainty in the estimation of the ship-emission rates. Because CO\(_2\) is the principal product, the CO\(_2\) balance could be a useful method for estimating the ship emission rate (Hobbs et al., 2000; Sinha et al., 2003). In general, the ideal reaction formula for complete oxidation in ship diesel powered-engines can be given by:

\[
C_xH_y + \left( x + \frac{y}{4} \right) O_2 = xCO_2 + \frac{y}{2}H_2O
\]

(R1)

where the \( y \) to \( x \) ratio is 1.8 (Tuttle, 1955). From Reaction (R1), the mass ratio of CO\(_2\) to \( C_xH_y \) is 3.2. Therefore, the mass flux of CO\(_2\) from fuel combustion is 3.2 times the fuel consumption rate. Chen et al. (2005) reported that the emission factors for NO\(_x\) and SO\(_2\) in the ship experiment were 20±8 (gN/kg fuel) and 30±4 (gSO\(_2\)/kg fuel) from the ratios of \( \Delta NO_x/\Delta CO_2 \), and \( \Delta SO_2/\Delta CO_2 \) with same mass balance (Hobbs et al., 2000; Sinha et al., 2003). The NO\(_x\) and SO\(_2\) emission rates were calculated to be 6.25 (g s\(^{-1}\)) and 9.38 (g s\(^{-1}\)), respectively, based on the diesel-powered fuel consumption of a ship (27 ton day\(^{-1}\)) (Table 2).

### 3.3 Observations vs. model-predictions

A comparison study was carried out using the ITCT 2K2 aircraft observation data to evaluate the simulation performance of the newly-developed ship-plume chemistry model. As mentioned previously, the variables for the model simulations, such as emission rates, meteorological conditions, aerosol-related variables and background con-
centrations of the gas and particulate species, were obtained directly or inferred indirectly from the NOAA WP-3D airborne observations. Among the observed atmospheric species, the concentrations of the five species, which include gas-phase primary and secondary pollutants (\(\text{NO}_x\), \(\text{NO}_y\), \(\text{O}_3\), \(\text{HNO}_3\), and \(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4\)), were compared with the model-predicted concentrations. Only the five species concentrations were compared in this study due to the measurement response times of the atmospheric species. Since the WP-3D aircraft traversed the ship plume at very high speeds (~360 km h\(^{-1}\)) but the plume widths were relatively narrow (0.47–4.14 km), the volume of in-plume data was limited when the measurement response times of the species are not sufficiently fast. Only the five gas-phase species have sufficiently fast response times, whereas particulate species have longer response times. For example, the PILS-IC instrument has a measurement time resolution of ~4 min. Although \(\text{SO}_2\) has a fast measurement response time, it was excluded from this analysis. This is because the \(\text{SO}_2\) data measured by the aircraft were so scattered that it is difficult to distinguish the plume shape from the background at the eight ship-plume transects, which was partly due to instrument limitations (refer to Chen et al., 2005). In addition, as mentioned previously, the WP-3D flight traversed the ship plume at an angle of approximately 59°. Therefore, for the purpose of comparison, the model-calculated data was sampled along the eight cross sections.

Figure 4 shows the comparison results of \(\text{NO}_x\) from transects A to H. As discussed in Sect. 3.2, the most likely atmospheric stability class of the MBL would be between moderately stable (E) and stable (F). Therefore, these two stability classes were chosen for the modeling conditions. As shown in Fig. 4a to h, the concentrations of \(\text{NO}_x\) (≡\(\text{NO}+\text{NO}_2\)) decreased continuously due to turbulent dispersion (or dilution) and atmospheric photochemical transformation. As shown in Fig. 4, the newly-developed ship-plume photochemical model captures the observed concentrations reasonably well. As expected, the levels of \(\text{NO}_x\) presented by the dashed lines (stable class F) were higher than those by the solid lines (moderately stable class E) due to less active turbulent dispersion in the stable class.
Although there was good agreement between observed and model-generated concentrations, there was a relatively large discrepancy in plume transect A. As the plume ages, there is a decrease in differences between the observed and model-predicted concentrations. The two possible causes of such discrepancies are: (1) influence of air motion caused by flight movement and (2) effect of other polluted plumes. When the ship plume is fresh, it is easy to distort the plume shape by air motion. However, the possible deformation effects of the plume concentration were decreased with plume aging. In addition, as suggested by Chen et al. (2005), the initial location of the ship experiment is a moderately polluted area. Therefore, the plume concentrations can be affected by other pollution sources. However, again the discrepancies are reduced when ship plume is fully developed.

Figure 5 shows the model-predicted and observed NO\(_y\) concentrations. Here, NO\(_y\) is defined as NO+NO\(_2\)+NO\(_3\)+2N\(_2\)O\(_5\)+HNO\(_3\)+HONO+HNO\(_4\)+PAN+NO\(_3^-\)+Organic nitrates. Again, there were relatively large discrepancies in the early plume aging steps, which decreased as the plumes aged photochemically and dynamically. Because most of the NO\(_y\) is occupied by NO\(_x\), the differences between the observed and model-predicted NO\(_y\) concentrations are similar to those of NO\(_x\).

Figures 6 to 8 show the comparison results for secondary gas-phase pollutants: O\(_3\), HNO\(_3\), and H\(_2\)SO\(_4\). As shown in Fig. 6, the newly-developed ship-plume photochemical model captures the atmospheric O\(_3\) chemistry greatly. In the early plume development stages (Fig. 6a and b), the O\(_3\) levels are depleted below the background ozone level (40 ppbv) at the plume centerline, whereas they appear to be produced at the edges of the ship plume. These “non-linear” changes in the O\(_3\) concentrations are caused by ozone titration and recovery processes at the ship-plume cross-section.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NO} + \text{O}_3 & \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{O}_2 \quad (\text{R2}) \\
\text{NO}_2 + \text{hv} & \rightarrow \text{O}(^3\text{P}) + \text{NO} \quad (\text{R3}) \\
\text{O}(^3\text{P}) + \text{O}_2 & \underset{M}{\rightarrow} \text{O}_3 \quad (\text{R4})
\end{align*}
\]
When a ship emits a plume, O$_3$ is titrated instantaneously by NO via Reaction (R2), because 95% of the NO$_x$ emitted from the ships is NO on a mass basis (Hewitt, 2001), and NO is also found in the excessive levels. At the beginning of the plume age, the O$_3$ concentrations even decreased to almost 0 ppbv (Song et al., 2003a). After ozone titration, the O$_3$ level was recovered by the photo-dissociation of NO$_2$ (a temporary storage of ozone) and subsequent O$_3$ formation process via Reactions (R3) and (R4) as well as by the entrainment of background ozone. As the ship plume develops, the levels of NO$_x$ drop, maintaining Gaussian shapes in the lateral and vertical (y- and z-) directions. Because of these Gaussian distributions, the edges of the ship plumes first enter the O$_3$ recovery stage (i.e., both Reactions (R3) and (R4) are active in this stage). However, the center of the plume is still in the O$_3$ titration mode (i.e., Reaction (R2) is dominant). As shown in Fig. 6a and b, this model can clearly capture these “non-linear” O$_3$ titration-recovery characteristics over the ship-plume cross-sections. This clearly shows why the “entire ship-plume” model is necessary. Further analysis of the non-linear (and non-Gaussian) characteristics of the secondary pollutants, such as hydroxyl radicals (OH), across the ship-plume cross sections will be reported in Sect. 5. After the early plume development stage, the “entire” plume enters the O$_3$ production mode. In Fig. 6c–h, the O$_3$ concentrations were higher than the background O$_3$ concentration of 40 ppbv with Gaussian shapes across the ship-plume cross sections.

Figure 7 shows the observed and model-predicted HNO$_3$ concentrations. In this comparison, two observation-based HNO$_3$ concentrations were used: (i) HNO$_3$ concentrations measured directly by Chemical Ionization Mass Spectrometer (CIMS) (Huey et al., 2004) and (ii) HNO$_3$ concentrations estimated from the concentrations of total nitrogen oxides (NO$_y$). The latter was calculated by subtracting the measured NO$_x$, measured PAN, modeled particulate nitrate (NO$_3^-$), and modeled organic nitrate concentrations from the measured NO$_y$ concentrations because the major constituents of NO$_y$ are NO$_x$, HNO$_3$, PAN, NO$_3^-$, and organic nitrates (i.e., [HNO$_3$] ≈ [NO$_y$] - [NO$_x$] - [PAN] - [NO$_3^-$] - [Organic nitrates]). Here, the former (directly-measured plume HNO$_3$ concentrations) was used only as reference data, since they did not show plume shapes
(presumably, Gaussian) along the plume cross sections, as shown in Fig. 7 (see black circles in the panels). Accordingly, the latter HNO₃ concentrations were calculated and introduced in this analysis. In addition, the PAN observation device generated little available data inside the ship plume. Therefore, the measured average PAN concentration of 135 pptv was used in the latter HNO₃ concentration calculations (Chen et al., 2005). In Fig. 7, the value of the reaction probability of HNO₃ onto the sea-salt particle (γ_HNO₃,ss) was assumed to be 10⁻³ (this will be discusses further in Sect. 4).

In this analysis, the model performance (and heterogeneous parameterizations in the model) can be tested in two ways: (i) how close are the estimated HNO₃ concentrations (the latter) to directly-measured HNO₃ concentrations (the former)? and (ii) how close are the model-calculated HNO₃ concentrations to both observation-based HNO₃ concentrations (i.e., the former and the latter HNO₃ concentrations)? As shown in Fig. 7a to h, the model-predicted HNO₃ concentrations (moderately stable case) capture the levels of the latter HNO₃ across the ship-plume cross sections reasonably well, except for the early plume-aging stages, such as transects A and B. Since NOₓ is the most abundant species in NOᵧ, any uncertainty in the observed NOₓ will affect the NOᵧ levels and hence the estimated HNO₃ (the latter) levels in this comparison study. The estimated HNO₃ concentrations (open rectangles and triangles in Fig. 7) were higher than the directly-measured HNO₃ concentrations (open black circles in Fig. 7) before the transect D. This was attributed to the high measured NOₓ concentrations from transects A to D. However, from transect E, the estimated HNO₃ concentrations was similar to the directly-measured HNO₃ concentrations with “γ_HNO₃,ss=10⁻³”. (Sect. 4 will examine the influences of relaxation of γ_HNO₃,ss from 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻¹). Here, it should also be noted that since the MBL conditions considered in this study had low NMVOC concentrations, the “missing NOᵧ” may be small (i.e., [directly measured HNO₃]≤[estimated HNO₃], again see panels e–h in Fig. 7) (Finlayson-Pitts and Pitts, 2000).

The atmospheric levels of HNO₃ are controlled by HNO₃ production and destruction processes. The major atmospheric production and destruction processes of HNO₃ in
the MBL are believed to take place via the following reaction schemes:

\[ \text{NO}_2 + \text{OH} \xrightarrow{M} \text{HNO}_3 \]  
\[ \text{NO}_3 + \text{DMS} \rightarrow \text{HNO}_3 + \text{products} \]  
\[ \text{HNO}_3 + \text{NaCl} \xrightarrow{\text{hetero}} \text{NaNO}_3 + \text{HCl} \]

where DMS in Reaction (R6) represents dimethylsulfide, and Reaction (R7) represents the heterogeneous conversion of HNO\(_3\) into particulate nitrate (NO\(_3^-\)), which could be associated preferably with Na\(^+\) inside the sea-salt particles. As discussed in Sect. 2.1, this heterogeneous conversion of gas-phase HNO\(_3\) was parameterized, using Schwartz kinetics with \(\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}=10^{-3}\) in Fig. 7. Therefore, these comparison studies can provide a good opportunity for testing this parameterization describing the heterogeneous conversion of HNO\(_3\) into sea-salt particles. This issue will be discussed further in Sect. 4.

Figure 8 shows the observed and model-predicted H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) concentrations. Although the comparison results between the observed and model-predicted H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) levels show good agreement with each other (Fig. 8), the model-predicted H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) concentrations were more or less higher than the observed values, particularly at the early plume-development stages, as shown in Fig. 8a and b. More detailed atmospheric species information, such as the OH radical and sulfate concentrations, will be needed to determine the exact causes of these over-predictions. However, the ITCT WP-3D flight OH and sulfate measurements did not have sufficiently fast time resolution. The possible causes of the over-predictions could be: (i) possible overestimations of the OH radical concentrations from the ship-plume photochemical model and (ii) possible uncertainties in H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) scavenging process parameterization and/or heterogeneous accommodation coefficient of H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) (\(\alpha_{\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4,ss}\)). However, the agreements between the observed and model-predicted H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) concentrations get improved as the ship plume develops. Although the observed and model-predicted SO\(_2\) and OH concentrations
were not compared in this study, the H$_2$SO$_4$ comparisons suggest that our ship-plume photochemical model reproduces both the ship-plume SO$_2$ and OH concentrations reasonably well. In addition, the parameterizations to describe the heterogeneous conversion of H$_2$SO$_4$ into ship-plume particles in this work would be accurate (refer to Sect. 2.1).

Figure 9 shows scatter plots of the model-predicted and flight-observed species concentrations. As discussed previously, the comparisons between the predicted and observed concentrations of the five species show good correlations around the 1:1 line. As shown in Fig. 9a to e, the correlation coefficients ($R$) with the “moderately stable” and “stable” conditions range between from 0.67 to 0.85, and from 0.66 to 0.83, respectively (except for HNO$_3$). For further statistical investigations, the following four statistical parameters were introduced for error and bias analyses: (1) Root Mean Square Error (RMSE; absolute error), (2) Mean Normalized Gross Error (MNGE; relative error), (3) Mean Bias (MB; absolute bias), and (4) Mean Normalized Bias (MNB; relative bias).

\[
\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (C_{i,\text{Pred}} - C_{i,\text{Obs}})^2}
\]

\[
\text{MNGE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left| \frac{C_{i,\text{Pred}} - C_{i,\text{Obs}}}{C_{i,\text{Pred}}} \right| \times 100
\]

\[
\text{MB} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (C_{i,\text{Pred}} - C_{i,\text{Obs}})
\]

\[
\text{MNB} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \frac{C_{i,\text{Pred}} - C_{i,\text{Obs}}}{C_{i,\text{Obs}}} \right) \times 100
\]
where $C_{i,\text{Pred}}$ and $C_{i,\text{Obs}}$ denote the predicted and observed concentrations of atmospheric species “$i$”, respectively. The statistical analyses were carried out with the species concentrations within $\pm 2\sigma$ of the ship-plume distributions at the eight transects. The results are summarized in Table 3. The negative values in MBs and MNBs originated from the higher values of the observed NO$_x$ and NO$_y$ in the early plume-development stages. Based on the correlation (Fig. 9) and the error/bias analyses (Table 3), it appears that the moderately stable (E) condition can produce slightly more accurate predicted species concentrations than the stable condition (F). Therefore, “moderately stable” conditions (E) were used for further analyses.

4 Reaction probability of HNO$_3$ into sea-salt particles

In Sect. 3, the overall model performances were tested by a comparison with the ITCT 2K2 aircraft observation data. With this comparison framework, an attempt was made to evaluate the magnitude of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$. For this evaluation, sensitivity runs were carried out. The magnitude of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ has been investigated in many laboratory experiments (e.g., Fenter et al., 1994; Laux et al., 1994; Abbatt and Waschewsky, 1998; Davis and Cox, 1998; Guimbud et al., 2002; Ghosal and Hemminger, 2004; Tolocka et al., 2004; Saul et al., 2006; Lui et al., 2007). However, as shown in Table 4, $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ ranges widely from $\sim 10^{-1}$ to $\sim 10^{-4}$. For example, Abbatt and Waschewsky (1998) reported $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ to be $>0.2$, whereas other groups reported $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ to be $\sim 10^{-4}$ (e.g., Laux et al., 1994; Davis and Cox, 1998). There appears to be large uncertainty in the magnitude of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$. Therefore, it is believed that a determination of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ using “field-observation data” is imperative. This is the first modeling study to evaluate the magnitude of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ with “field-observation data”.

Based on the values shown in Table 4, the values of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ were relaxed between $10^{-4}$ and $10^{-1}$ in this model sensitivity study. Figure 10 show the results of the sensitivity runs for the determination of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$. As mentioned in Sect. 3.3, two (directly-
measured and estimated) HNO₃ concentrations were used in this analysis. Again, in order to evaluate the magnitude of γ_{HNO₃,ss}, two items were examined: (i) how close are the estimated HNO₃ concentrations to the directly-measured HNO₃ concentrations? and (ii) how close are the model-calculated HNO₃ concentrations to both observation-based HNO₃ concentrations? Among the results, this paper presents the data from three sensitivity model runs with γ_{HNO₃,ss}=10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, and 5×10^{-3} in Fig. 10, because these model sensitivity runs show the best comparison results. The following occurred if γ_{HNO₃,ss}>5×10^{-3} are used: (i) several estimated HNO₃ concentrations (black circles in Fig. 10) become smaller than the directly-measured HNO₃ concentrations (red circles in Fig. 10) and (ii) several estimated HNO₃ concentrations become <0. Both appear to be unreasonable. In addition, the comparisons at the plume transects A and B in Fig. 10 were excluded, because large discrepancies were already found in the previous analysis (refer to Fig. 7).

The estimated HNO₃ concentrations were generally higher than the model-predicted HNO₃ concentrations with γ_{HNO₃,ss}=10^{-4} and 10^{-3}, as shown in Fig. 10, whereas the directly-observed HNO₃ concentrations were always lower than the model-predicted HNO₃ concentrations in all cases. The under-predictions of the HNO₃ concentrations at the plume transects C and D originated partly from the high levels of NO_y observed, as shown in Fig. 5. However, as the ship-plume ages, the simulation results with γ_{HNO₃,ss}=10^{-4} and 10^{-3} approach the estimated HNO₃ concentrations, and the estimated HNO₃ concentrations also approach the directly-measured HNO₃ levels. At the fully developed ship-plume stages (transects E to H), the simulations with γ_{HNO₃,ss}=5×10^{-3} over-predict the HNO₃ concentrations, and the estimated HNO₃ concentrations begin to be smaller than the directly-measured HNO₃ concentrations. Based on these comparison, it was concluded that the magnitude of γ_{HNO₃,ss} might be between 10^{-4} and 10^{-3}. However, further studies on the issue of γ_{HNO₃,ss} will be necessary.

Here, another issue that can be raised is the role of ammonia (NH₃) in the heterogeneous conversion of HNO₃. In a typical urban atmosphere, HNO₃ partitioning into
“acidic” urban particles tends to accompany NH₃ condensation (Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998):

\[ \text{HNO}_3 + \text{NH}_3 \leftrightarrow \text{NH}_4\text{NO}_3 \]  

(R8)

NH₃ condensation imparts alkalinity to “acidic” urban particles for the HNO₃ partitioning (Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998; Song and Carmichael, 1999, 2001). However, in the case of alkaline aerosols, such as sea-salt and mineral dust, there is already sufficient alkalinity inside the particles, so that accompanying NH₃ condensation is not necessary. On the other hand, although HNO₃ partitioning accompanies NH₃ condensation, NH₃ would be vaporize immediately because partitioned NO₃⁻ thermodynamically favors an association with Na⁺ or other inorganic cations inside the sea-salt particles rather than with NH₄⁺ (Song and Carmichael, 1999; Song et al., 2005).

5 NOₓ chemical lifetimes

A convenient way of examining the chemical evolution of pollution plumes is to quantify the NOₓ chemical lifetimes. Several research groups (e.g., Sillman et al., 1990; Karamchandani et al., 1998; Ryerson et al., 1998, 2001; Sillman, 2000) examined the plume NOₓ chemical lifetime to evaluate the chemical evolution of power-plant plumes. On the other hand, Lawrence and Crutzen (1999) examined the chemical lifetimes of NOₓ emitted from ocean-going ships within the MBL, using an Eulerian 3-D photochemical model. However, the NOₓ chemical lifetimes were overestimated because their modeling study bypassed the nonlinear ship-plume NOₓ chemistry. In order to include the nonlinear ship-plume chemistry, von Glasow et al. (2003) and Song et al. (2003a) used a Lagrangian photochemical box model to estimate the NOₓ chemical lifetimes more accurately. Their results clearly showed that the elevation of the plume OH concentrations reduces the NOₓ chemical lifetime by a factor of 2.5~3.0. Nevertheless, their study had some limitations in that: (i) the estimations were made only along the plume centerline, where it is difficult to demonstrate/represent the chemical evolution of the...
“entire volume” of the ship plume, and (ii) the model was used without adequate model verification. Here, the ship-plume NO\textsubscript{x} chemical lifetimes were examined again using the newly developed ship-plume photochemical model, which can reflect the chemical aging of the entire ship-plume volume. The “instantaneous NO\textsubscript{x} lifetime (\(\tau\textsubscript{iNO}_x\))” defines how fast NO\textsubscript{x} is lost at a given point of time. \(\tau\textsubscript{iNO}_x\) is defined as the NO\textsubscript{x} concentration at a given point of time divided by the rate of NO\textsubscript{x} loss (\(L\textsubscript{iNO}_x\)) at a given time (Sillman, 2000; Song et al., 2003a; Chen et al., 2005; Han et al., 2009):

\[
L\textsubscript{iNO}_x = k_1[\text{OH}][\text{NO}_2] + k_2[\text{NO}_3][\text{DMS}] + k_{mt,\text{NO}_3}[\text{NO}_3] + 2k_{mt,\text{N}_2\text{O}_5}[\text{N}_2\text{O}_5] + k_3[\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_3][\text{NO}_2] - (k_4 + J_1)[\text{PAN}]
\] (15)

\[
\tau\textsubscript{iNO}_x = \frac{[\text{NO}] + [\text{NO}_2]}{L\textsubscript{iNO}_x}
\] (16)

where \(k_1\), \(k_2\), \(k_3\), and \(k_4\) are the thermal reaction rate coefficients; \(k_{mt,\text{NO}_3}\) and \(k_{mt,\text{N}_2\text{O}_5}\) are the mass transfer coefficients (s\(^{-1}\)) for the heterogeneous conversion of atmospheric NO\textsubscript{3} and N\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} radicals, respectively (refer to Eqs. 1 and 2); and \(J_1\) is the photo-dissociation rate coefficient of PAN.

A “moderately stable” condition was assumed in the estimations of \(\tau\textsubscript{iNO}_x\). The estimated results are presented in Fig. 11. Panels a–h in Fig. 11 correspond sequentially to plume transects A–H. Because the overall rate of NO\textsubscript{x} loss in Eq. (15) is controlled mainly by the NO\textsubscript{2}+OH reaction, the OH radical concentrations (dashed blue lines) tend to be inversely correlated with \(\tau\textsubscript{iNO}_x\) (solid red lines) throughout the panels a–h in Fig. 11. Highly non-linear and non-Gaussian shape of the distribution in OH concentrations and \(\tau\textsubscript{iNO}_x\) were observed at plume transect A. Such non-linear chemistry occurs not only “along the plume-adveacting direction” (i.e., x-direction), but also “across the plume cross-section” (i.e., y- and z-directions). This is one of the main reasons why the development of entire-volume ship-plume model is necessary. After the plume transects A and B, both the OH concentrations and \(\tau\textsubscript{iNO}_x\) have Gaussian shapes across the
plume cross-sections (C–H), with mirror-images of each other.

The averaged OH concentrations ([OH]) and instantaneous $\tau_{NOx}^i$ ($\tau_{NOx}^i$) across the plume cross-sections (A–H) are also shown inside the panels a–h in Fig. 11. In particular, $\tau_{NOx}^i$ was calculated, considering the distribution of NO$_x$ concentrations, i.e.:

$$w_j = \frac{NO_x|_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} NO_x|_j}$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

$$\tau_{NOx}^i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tau_{NOx}^i|_j w_j$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

where $w_j$, NO$_x|_j$, and $\tau_{NOx}^i|_j$ represent the weight factor (or NO$_x$ fraction), NO$_x$ concentrations, and estimated instantaneous NO$_x$ lifetime ($\tau_{NOx}^i$) at the $j^{th}$ bin of the NO$_x$ distribution across a ship-plume cross-section, respectively. $n$ is the total number of bins of the NO$_x$ distribution across a ship-plume cross-section. The bins considered in this estimation ranged from $+3\sigma$ to $-3\sigma$. Figure 12 was drawn to show the changes in [OH] and $\tau_{NOx}^i$ along the ship-plume travel distances under the “moderately stable” condition. Here, there is highly non-linear ship-plume photochemistry along the “plume-advecting” direction (i.e., in the x-direction). The [OH] and $\tau_{NOx}^i$ along the plume-advecting direction also have mirror-image distributions. The estimated $\tau_{NOx}^i$ ranges from 2.30 to 3.16 (h), and $\tau_{NOx}^i$ averaged over entire ship-plume is 2.90 (h). In addition, [OH] ranges from $0.87 \times 10^7$ to $1.56 \times 10^7$ (# cm$^{-3}$). Since the measured background OH radical concentrations were $0.61 \times 10^7$ # cm$^{-3}$, the ship-plume OH concentrations were elevated by factors of 1.4 to 2.6 as a result of the ship-plume chemistry. On the other hand, if $\tau_{NOx}^i$
is compared with the observed background NO$_x$ lifetime ($\tau_{NO_x}^b$) of $\sim$6.5 h (Chen et al., 2005), it can be concluded that the nonlinear ship-plume chemistry shortens the NO$_x$ chemical lifetimes by a factor of $\sim$2.2. The instantaneous NO$_x$ lifetime ($\tau_{NO_x}^i$) averaged over the plume cross-sections were integrated further along the plume-advection direction (i.e., integration of $\tau_{NO_x}^i$ along the red solid line shown in Fig. 12). This lifetime is called the “equivalent NO$_x$ lifetime ($\tau_{NO_x}^{eq}$”), which can be calculated using the following formula (Chen et al., 2005):

$$\tau_{NO_x}^{eq} = \frac{\Delta t}{t + \Delta t} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \tau_{NO_x}^i$$

(19)

where $\Delta t$ denotes the estimation period of chemical evolution. The value of $\tau_{NO_x}^{eq}$ estimated by Eq. (19) from the plume transects A to H (i.e., $\Delta t$=135 min) is 2.79 h. $\tau_{NO_x}^{eq}$ of 2.79 h is quite close to the simply averaged $\tau_{NO_x}^i$ of 2.90 h. Again, the non-linear ship-plume chemistry shortens the NO$_x$ lifetime considerably. $\tau_{NO_x}^{eq}$ was evaluated further from the “location of the ship stack” (i.e., travel distance $x$=0) to the approximate plume ending point (i.e., $x$=180 km) $\tau_{NO_x}^{eq}$ was estimated to be $\sim$3.36 h because the early plume development stage has a relatively longer NO$_x$ lifetime.

The lifetimes of 3.36 h are rather smaller than that used by Beirle et al. (2004) ($\tau_{NO_x}^{eq}$=3.70 h at 10:30 a.m. LST, the GOME passing local time). The accurate estimation of ship NO$_x$ lifetime is of primary importance, particularly in the estimation of NO$_x$ emissions from ocean-going ships using satellite NO$_2$ columns, as carried out by Beirle et al. (2004). Furthermore, the NO$_x$ lifetimes inferred from this study are larger than those reported by Chen et al. (2005) ($\tau_{NO_x}^{eq}$=1.81–2.38 h). On the other hand, the lifetimes from this study can be compared with those from power plant plume studies. Nunnermacker et al. (2000) reported NO$_x$ lifetimes of 2.8–4.2 h. NO$_x$ lifetime study of a
ship plume can also be important, particularly when satellite-derived NO$_2$ columns are compared with 3-D chemistry-transfer model-predicted NO$_2$ columns for large-scale point sources, such as power plants (e.g., Kim et al., 2006; Han et al., 2009).

6 General characteristics of ship-plume chemical evolution

Sections 3 to 5 evaluated the performance of the newly developed ship-plume photochemical model, and examined the chemical evolution of ship plumes. However, the discussions were mainly of the measured five ship-plume species (NO$_x$, NO$_y$, O$_3$, HNO$_3$, and H$_2$SO$_4$) and the estimated OH radical concentrations. This section investigates the more general characteristics of the ship-plume chemical evolution. To do so, the ship-plume photochemical model was allowed to analyze the concentrations of ten major species. Figure 13 shows the changes in the concentrations of those species. Here, the open circles and bars represent the observed average concentrations and concentrations at ±σ at the eight transects, respectively. Both the solid and dashed lines represent the transect-averaged species concentrations calculated from the ship-plume photochemical model under moderately stable (E) and stable (F) conditions, respectively.

In Fig. 13b and i, as ship-plume develops, the concentrations of the primary pollutants, such as NO$_x$ and SO$_2$, decrease almost exponentially due to dilution and chemical transformations. The changes in NO$_y$ tend to follow the trends of NO$_x$, as shown in panels b and c, because the major constituent of NO$_y$ is NO$_x$. On the other hand, ozone is titrated due to the excessive NO levels via Reaction (R2) near the ship stack (or during the early plume development stage), which is then recovered via Reactions (R3) and (R4) as the NO$_x$ concentration decreases. Figure 13a shows the dynamics and non-linear characteristics. Because the main source of OH radicals is ozone, the level of OH productions was also suppressed by ozone titration. However, as ozone is recovered, the OH radical concentrations are also recovered via Reactions (R9) and (R10).
as shown in Fig. 13h:

\[
\text{O}_3 + \text{hv} \rightarrow \text{O}^1(\text{D}) + \text{O}_2 \quad \text{(R9)}
\]

\[
\text{O}^1(\text{D}) + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{OH} \quad \text{(R10)}
\]

When ozone depletion occurs, the OH concentration decreases to almost 0 (note, plume aging time of 0 in Fig. 13h was around 11:00 a.m. LST). However, the OH concentration increases as the ozone is recovered, reaching a maximum level around noon. After that, its concentration decreases again. The hydroxyl radical (OH) is the major oxidant in the atmosphere. Its atmospheric oxidation reactions produce two reservoir species in both the N- and S-cycles: \(\text{HNO}_3\) and \(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4\). As mentioned previously, there are discrepancies between the observed and model-predicted \(\text{HNO}_3\) and \(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4\) concentrations at the early plume-development stages. However, there is a decrease in the differences between the model-predicted and observed \(\text{HNO}_3\) and \(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4\) concentrations as the plume ages photochemically. Since both the \(\text{HNO}_3\) and \(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4\) concentrations are controlled by the OH concentrations, their concentrations decrease after noontime. Figure 13e and f shows the changes in the nighttime species, \(\text{N}_2\text{O}_5\) and \(\text{NO}_3\). Although \(\text{N}_2\text{O}_5\) and \(\text{NO}_3\) are nighttime species, the excessive \(\text{NO}_2\) concentrations increase the levels of these nighttime species to almost several pptv levels, even during the daytime. This type of phenomena was reported previously by Song et al. (2003a).

In general, the model-simulation results show good agreement with the observed concentrations. As mentioned previously, the turbulent dispersion is governed mainly by the atmospheric stability class. Therefore, the model-simulated primary species concentrations (\(\text{NO}_x\) and \(\text{SO}_2\)) in the “stable” condition are usually higher than those in the “moderately stable” condition. However, this is not always the case for secondary species because the ship-plume chemistry is highly non-linear. Moreover, the trends are reversed during the ship-plume development stages if one examines the changes in the ozone, OH, \(\text{NO}_3\) and PAN concentrations (see Fig. 10e–h).
7 Conclusions

In this study, the photochemical ship-plume model was developed to make a better understanding of the chemical evolution processes of a ship plume. In particular, to simulate the chemical evolution of the “entire volume” of the ship plume, the concentration distribution of the primary pollutants, such as NO\textsubscript{x} and SO\textsubscript{2}, were assumed to have Gaussian distributions. Being driven by the Gaussian-distributed primary pollutants, the newly developed photochemical ship-plume model provides information on the chemical evolution of the ship-plume.

The simulation performance of the newly developed ship-plume model was evaluated by a comparison with the data obtained from a ship-plume measurement experiment carried out around noon on 8 May 2002 by a NOAA WP-3D aircraft. The model-simulation conditions were obtained directly and/or inferred indirectly from the NOAA WP-3D observations. In particular, the atmospheric stability conditions were estimated, analyzing the temperature profiles measured or obtained from the WP-3D aircraft observations and NCEP reanalysis data. Based on the analysis, it was determined that the likely stability class within the MBL would be between the “moderately stable” and “stable” conditions. The primary pollutant concentrations, such as NO\textsubscript{x} and SO\textsubscript{2}, always showed higher values in the “stable” condition than in the “moderately stable” condition. In contrast, due to the non-linear ship-plume chemistry, the concentrations of the secondary pollutants, such as O\textsubscript{3}, OH, and NO\textsubscript{3}, are higher in the moderately stable condition during the early ship-plume development stage. Correlation analysis between the observed and model-predicted ship-plume concentrations was carried out to analyze the model-simulation performances in more detail. The results from the moderately stable condition showed stronger correlations than those from the stable condition. In addition, the results from statistical analysis showed that the simulations under moderately stable condition produced concentrations closer to the observed ship-plume concentrations than under the stable condition.

The magnitude of the reaction probability of HNO\textsubscript{3} onto sea-salt particles (γ\textsubscript{HNO\textsubscript{3},ss})
was also investigated. From the study, it was concluded that the magnitude of $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ might be in the order of $10^{-3}$ or smaller. In addition, the equivalent NO$_x$ lifetimes throughout the “entire” plume were also estimated from ship-plume photochemical modeling. The chemical NO$_x$ lifetime throughout the “entire ship plume” was estimated to be 3.36 h. This results clearly show that an increase in the levels of atmospheric oxidants in the ship plumes reduce the chemical lifetime of NO$_x$ within the MBL by a factor of 2.5~3.0.

On the other hand, Russell et al. (1999) examined the effect of ship-emitted aerosols on the cloud properties in a “ship track” using both an aerosol microphysical model, which can consider condensational and coagulational growth, and a cloud microphysics model. In their study, the Monterey Area Ship Track (MAST) experiment data, which had been measured in almost the same area where the WP-3D aircraft observations were made, had been used. However, although their study employed detailed aerosol microphysical and cloud microphysics models, it was limited in that (i) the model study did not consider the highly non-linear ship plume chemistry, and (ii) it did not account for the ship-plume dilution processes, and therefore the entrainment processes of the background air into the ship-plume volume. However, such limitations can be overcome if the developed ship-plume photochemical model is used. Therefore, it is expected that the combination of both detailed aerosol microphysical and cloud microphysics models with the ship-plume photochemical model shown in this study would allow more detailed ship track investigations in the future.
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Table 1. Formulas for the later and vertical dispersion parameters, $\sigma_y(x)$ and $\sigma_z(x)$, as a function of the downwind distance, $x(m)$, over the ocean.a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pasquill stability class</th>
<th>$\sigma_y (m)^b$</th>
<th>$\sigma_z (m)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For $x&lt;10$ km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$0.11x(u/u_r)(1+0.0001x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.10x(u/u_r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$0.08x(u/u_r)(1+0.0001x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.06x(u/u_r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$0.055x(u/u_r)(1+0.0001x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.04x(u/u_r)(1+0.0002x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$0.04x(u/u_r)(1+0.0001x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.03x(u/u_r)(1+0.0015x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$0.03x(u/u_r)(1+0.0001x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.015x(u/u_r)(1+0.0003x(u/u_r))^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$0.02x(u/u_r)(1+0.0001x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.008x(u/u_r)(1+0.0003x(u/u_r))^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For $x&gt;10$ km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$0.11x(u/u_r)(1+u/u_r)^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.10x(u/u_r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$0.08x(u/u_r)(1+u/u_r)^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.06x(u/u_r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$0.055x(u/u_r)(1+u/u_r)^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.04x(u/u_r)(1+0.0002x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$0.04x(u/u_r)(1+u/u_r)^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.03x(u/u_r)(1+0.0015x(u/u_r))^{-1/2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$0.03x(u/u_r)(1+u/u_r)^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.015x(u/u_r)(1+0.0003x(u/u_r))^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$0.02x(u/u_r)(1+u/u_r)^{-1/2}$</td>
<td>$0.008x(u/u_r)(1+0.0003x(u/u_r))^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Here, $u$ and $u_r$ represent the wind speed and resulting wind speed, respectively.

b Because the standard deviation for lateral fluctuation in the turbulent velocity is not allowed to drop below $0.5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ (Hanna et al., 1985), the minimum value for $\sigma_y$ is $0.5/u$. 
Table 2. Simulation conditions used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emission rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x} (g/s)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO\textsubscript{2} (g/s)</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorological conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky condition</td>
<td>Clear sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability class</td>
<td>Moderately stable (E), Stable (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind velocity (m/s)</td>
<td>9–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind direction</td>
<td>SSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing height (m)\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (° N)</td>
<td>36.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude (° W)</td>
<td>123.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving direction</td>
<td>WNW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed (knot)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosol-related variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background aerosol type</td>
<td>Sea-salt aerosols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosol surface area (µm\textsuperscript{2}/cm\textsuperscript{3})</td>
<td>90–120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ\textsubscript{N,O\textsubscript{x}}</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ\textsubscript{NO\textsubscript{3}}</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ\textsubscript{b}\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ\textsubscript{HNO\textsubscript{3}}</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a\textsubscript{c}\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a\textsubscript{d}\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α\textsubscript{H\textsubscript{2}SO\textsubscript{4}}</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosol pH\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background concentrations (ppbv)\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NO\textsubscript{x}]</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O\textsubscript{3}]</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CO]</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SO\textsubscript{2}]</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}]</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[H\textsubscript{2}SO\textsubscript{4}]</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[HNO\textsubscript{3}]</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PAN]\textsuperscript{g}</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Chen et al. (2005); \textsuperscript{b} Sensitivity tests were made over the range of γ\textsubscript{HNO\textsubscript{3}}=10\textsuperscript{-4}–10\textsuperscript{-1} (refer to Sect. 4 in this manuscript); \textsuperscript{c} Worsnop et al. (1989); \textsuperscript{d} Jefferson et al. (1997); \textsuperscript{e} Assumed, based on Song et al. (2003b); \textsuperscript{f} Obtained from WP-3D aircraft observations; also, refer to Chen et al. (2005); \textsuperscript{g} Chen et al. (2005).
### Table 3. Statistical analysis with observed and model-predicted plume concentrations at eight transects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Moderately Stable (E)</th>
<th>Stable (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSE (^a)</td>
<td>MNGE (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{NO}_x)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>53.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{NO}_y)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>54.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{O}_3)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{HNO}_3)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>68.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>30.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Units are in ppbv, except for \(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4\).

\(^b\) Units are in %.

\(^c\) For \(\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4\), the units for RMSE and NB are in pptv.
Table 4. Uptake coefficients of HNO$_3(g)$ onto NaCl and sea-salt particles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of aerosol</th>
<th>Uptake coefficient, $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3}$</th>
<th>$D_p^a$ (µm)</th>
<th>RH (%)</th>
<th>Experimental Technique</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NaCl, NaBr, KCl, and KBr</td>
<td>$(2.8\pm0.3)\times10^{-2}$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>QMA$^b$</td>
<td>Fenter et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>$(4\pm2)\times10^{-4}$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>XPS$^c$</td>
<td>Laux et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>2–4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>CIMS$^d$</td>
<td>Abbatt and Waschewsky (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>$(0.28–1.10)\times10^{-4}$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mass spectrometer</td>
<td>Davis and Cox (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea-salt</td>
<td>0.5±0.2</td>
<td>~0.07</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>N$^{13}$ isotope tracer</td>
<td>Guimbaud et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>$(5.25\pm3)\times10^{-3}$</td>
<td>1–10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>XPS</td>
<td>Ghosal and Hemminger (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>$(0.49–12.0)\times10^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.11–0.22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>SPMS$^e$</td>
<td>Tolocka et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl and NaCl/MgCl$_2$</td>
<td>$(0.23–1.26)\times10^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.10–0.233</td>
<td>10–85</td>
<td>SPMS</td>
<td>Saul et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl, NaCl/MgCl$_2$, and Sea-salt</td>
<td>~0.02</td>
<td>1.1–3.4</td>
<td>20–80</td>
<td>CCSEM/EDX$^f$</td>
<td>Lui et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ $D_p$ represents the aerodynamic diameter of a particle;  
$^b$ Quadrupole Mass Analyzer;  
$^c$ X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy;  
$^d$ Chemical Ionization Mass Spectrometer;  
$^e$ Single Particle Mass Spectrometer;  
Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of ship-plume dispersion, (a) when \( \sigma_z < 0.8 \) h and (b) when \( \sigma_z > 0.8 \) h. (c) The illustration is shown for multiple Lagrangian ship-plume photochemical box runs.
Fig. 2. Eight ship-plume transects (A–H) made by NOAA WP-3D flight near the California coast (Chen et al., 2005). I, II, and III denote three locations where the NCEP reanalysis data were obtained.
Fig. 3. Comparison between actual lapse rate ($\Gamma$) and adiabatic lapse rate ($\Gamma_a$) for the determination of stability class of the MBL (a) with observations measured by NOAA WP-3D flight and (b) with NCEP 6 hourly reanalysis-2 pressure level data.
Fig. 4. Model-predicted vs. observed NO\textsubscript{x} concentrations across the eight ship-plume transects (A–H) under the stability classes of “moderately stable (E)” and “stable (F)”. Panels (a–h) correspond to the comparison at the ship-plume transects A–H, sequentially.
Fig. 5. As Fig. 4, except for NO$_y$.  
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Fig. 6. As Fig. 4, except for O₃.
Fig. 7. As Fig. 4, except for HNO₃. $Y_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ of $10^{-3}$ was used in this study.
Fig. 8. As Fig. 4, except for H$_2$SO$_4$. 
Fig. 9. Scatter plots of observed and model-predicted ship-plume concentrations: (a) NO$_x$; (b) NO$_y$; (c) O$_3$; (d) HNO$_3$; (e) H$_2$SO$_4$. The red circles and blue triangles represent the concentrations predicted by the ship-plume photochemical model under moderately stable and stable conditions, respectively. For HNO$_3$, the estimated HNO$_3$ concentrations were used in panel (d).
Fig. 10. Sensitivity tests for determining the reaction probability of HNO₃ into sea-salt particles ($\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$). $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss}$ was relaxed from $10^{-4}$ to $5 \times 10^{-3}$. The first, second, and third columns represent the comparison results with $\gamma_{\text{HNO}_3,ss} = 10^{-4}$, $10^{-3}$, and $5 \times 10^{-3}$, respectively, at transects C to H.
Fig. 11. OH radical concentrations and NO\textsubscript{x} lifetimes across the ship-plume transects A–H. [OH] and [\textit{\tau}_{\text{NOx}}] represent the averaged OH concentration and instantaneous NO\textsubscript{x} lifetime over the ship-plume transects A–H, respectively. UBoM 2K8 models were run at the stability condition of “moderately stable (E)”. The panels (a–h) correspond to the results at the ship-plume transects A–H, sequentially.
Fig. 12. Changes in [OH] and $[\tau_{i, NOx}]$ along the ship-plume travel distances under the stability condition of “moderately stable (E)”. The bars represent the OH radical concentrations at $\pm \sigma$ in the eight ship-plume transects A–H.
Fig. 13. Changes in ten major ship-plume species concentrations along the ship-plume travel times: (a) \( \text{O}_3 \); (b) \( \text{NO}_x \); (c) \( \text{NO}_y \); (d) \( \text{HNO}_3 \); (e) \( \text{N}_2\text{O}_5 \); (f) \( \text{NO}_3 \); (g) PANs; (h) \( \text{OH} \); (i) \( \text{SO}_2 \); (j) \( \text{H}_2\text{SO}_4 \). The open circles and bars represent the observed average concentrations and concentrations at \( \pm \sigma \). Here, the model runs were carried out with the stability class of “moderately stable (E)” and “stable (F)”. 