Interactive comment on “Iodine chemistry after dark” by Alfonso Saiz-Lopez et al.

We would like to thank Howard Roscoe for his comments and support. Below we provide a detailed point-by-point answer (AC – Author Comment) to each comment on our manuscript (RC – Referee Comment).

RC:
This paper makes an important point about atmospheric chemistry. It is scientifically sound and rigorous except for the few items in Minor Comments, and except perhaps for the theoretical calculations in Section 3 on which I am not competent to express an opinion. It is also well written, except for the trivia listed under Editorial Comments below.
Provided it receives a satisfactory review from experts in calculation of reaction rates, I have no hesitation in recommending it for publication in ACP after minor revision.

Minor comments:

RC:
1. p14 line22 - according to the caption of Figure 11 (p39) it applies to the region 110 to 106degE and 16 to 23degN. This region just touches the southern tip of Baja California but is centred a long way to its south. It just touches a coastal region of mainland Mexico, but is never at the “coastal region” even of Mexico let alone the stated Baja California - much of the region is in what might be called the open ocean. Presumably this region is chosen because of the large pollution amounts there that we infer from Figures 7, 8 and 9; but there is no discussion of why they should be so large - is it a concentration of shipping using the Panama Canal that spreads out further north?
AC:
The text and the caption have been changed to refer to an Ocean Pacific Region at the south of Baja California, instead of a “coastal region”. As pointed out by the reviewer, that zone was selected due to the high levels of NO₃ caused by pollution outflow from the west coasts of Mexico and USA and shipping lanes.

RC:
2. p6 line21 - given the argument of p6 lines17-18, why does a transition state 110 kN/mole above the reactants allow the reaction to proceed?
AC:
Please note that in that paragraph at the end of page 6 we are not saying that reaction 3 is viable. In fact we conclude at the end of the theoretical calculation section that only reactions 1 and 4 are likely to proceed.
RC:

3. Why do Figures 4 and 5 have time co-ordinates starting at 48 hours? Is this to allow a steady state to build up? - if so it should be discussed. And what version of time is it - time since midnight or time since noon? - a careful reading of text and figures tells us which, but it should be spelled out in the caption. And why do Figures 10 and 11 have time co-ordinates that start at 0 hours rather than 48? And although we can guess that time in Figures 10 and 11 is since midnight, is it mean solar midnight over the region, or solar midnight at the geographic centre of the region, or midnight in the local time zone at 108degE?

AC

Figure 4 and 5 represent data from the 1-D THAMO model, whereas figures 10 and 11 contain data from the 3-D CAM-Chem model. In a 1D model like THAMO 2 days of simulation are enough to reach steady conditions, so we have plotted the third day of simulation. On the other hand the 3D global model CAM-Chem needs at least 1 year to reach steady conditions throughout the marine troposphere. So we have run CAM-Chem for two years and then used the data from the second year. Figures 10 and 11 contain hourly averaged data during August and January respectively. Therefore we have used a more general local time 0-23 hours scale for Figure 10 and 11.

RC:

4. We are told in the text (p14 line2) that Figure 8 has “as in the previous figure”.. “nighttime averaged differences”, yet p13 line17 tells us that the previous figure, Figure 7, uses “midnight averages”. Which are used in which figures, and why do the captions not spell out the averaging hours as opposed to having them buried in the text?

AC:

Both Figure 7 and 8 correspond to night time averages from 0LT to 01LT. We have changed the text in p13 line17 to “nighttime averaged”. We decided not to include that data in the caption to avoid repetition of information.

Editorial comments:

RC:

p3 line3 introduces and defines MBL but it was already used without definition on p2 line15.

AC:

MBL defined for the first time in P2 line 15.

RC:

p3 line10 - surely, hyphens after “iodine” and “bromine” ?

AC:

Typo corrected
RC:
p4 line2 - delete “and”
AC:
Typo corrected.

RC:
p6 line12 - insert “of” after “energies”.
AC:
Typo corrected

RC:
p7 line13 - insert “the” after “of”.
AC:
Typo corrected

RC:
Fig4 lowest panel - the meanings of the four lines are not in the caption and their panel legends are obscure.
AC:
More information has been included in the caption to make the bottom panel clearer.

RC:
Figs 7, 8 and 9 - the captions do not say the altitude or the vertical extent of the averaging.
AC:
Included “at the surface level” at the end of the caption.

RC:
Fig10 - the right hand axis legend says “mixing ration”.
AC:
Typo corrected.

RC:
Fig10 caption - insert “the” after “at”.
AC:
Typo Corrected.

RC:
**Fig11 caption - say the altitude.**

AC:
Included “at the surface level” at the end of the caption.
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Abstract

Little attention has so far been paid to the nighttime atmospheric chemistry of iodine species. Current atmospheric models predict a buildup of HOI and I$_2$ during the night that leads to a spike of IO at sunrise, which is not observed by measurements. In this work, electronic structure calculations are used to survey possible reactions that HOI and I$_2$ could undergo at night in the lower troposphere, and hence reduce their nighttime accumulation. The new reaction NO$_3$ + HOI $\rightarrow$ IO + HNO$_3$ is proposed, with a rate coefficient calculated from statistical rate theory over the temperature range 260 - 300 K and at a pressure of 1000 hPa to be $k(T) = 2.7 \times 10^{-12} (300 \text{ K} / T)^{2.66} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. This reaction is included in two atmospheric models, along with the known reaction between I$_2$ and NO$_3$, to explore a new nocturnal iodine radical activation mechanism. The results show that this iodine scheme leads to a considerable reduction of nighttime HOI and I$_2$, which results in the enhancement of more than 25% of nighttime ocean emissions of HOI + I$_2$ and the removal of the anomalous spike of IO at sunrise. We suggest that active nighttime iodine can also have a considerable, so far unrecognized, impact on the reduction of the NO$_3$ radical levels in the marine boundary layer (MBL) and hence upon the nocturnal oxidizing capacity of the marine atmosphere. The effect of this is exemplified by the indirect effect on dimethyl sulfide (DMS) oxidation.
1. Introduction

Active nighttime iodine chemistry was first evidenced a decade ago when it was shown that nocturnal I$_2$ emitted by macroalgae could react with NO$_3$ leading to the formation of IO and OIO, which were measured in the coastal MBL at Mace Head, Ireland (Saiz-Lopez and Plane, 2004). The nitrate radical has also been recently suggested as a nocturnal loss of CH$_2$I$_2$, which helps to reconcile observed and modelled concentrations of this iodocarbon over the remote MBL (Carpenter et al., 2015). However, most of the work on reactive atmospheric iodine has focused on the use of daytime observations and models to assess its role in the catalytic destruction of ozone and the oxidizing capacity of the troposphere (e.g. Saiz-Lopez et al. (2012b) and references therein). In the MBL, iodine-, along with bromine-catalysed ozone destruction contributes up to 45% of the observed daytime depletion (Mahajan et al., 2010a; Read et al., 2008), although this contribution shows large geographical variability (Gómez Martín et al., 2013; Mahajan et al., 2012; Prados-Roman et al., 2015b; Volkamer et al., 2015). Iodine compounds have also been implicated in the formation of aerosols, although the mechanisms and magnitudes of these processes are not fully understood (Allan et al., 2015; Gomez Martin et al., 2013; Hoffmann et al., 2001; McFiggans et al., 2004; O'Dowd et al., 2002; Roscoe et al., 2015). Reactive forms of inorganic iodine may also contribute to the oxidation of elemental mercury over the tropical oceans (Wang et al., 2014). In recent years, iodine sources and chemistry have also been implemented in global models demonstrating the effect of iodine chemistry in the oxidation capacity of the global marine troposphere (Ordóñez et al., 2012; Saiz-Lopez et al., 2012a; Saiz-Lopez et al., 2014; Sherwen et al., 2016).

Iodine is emitted into the atmosphere from the ocean surface in both organic and inorganic forms. The main organic compounds emitted are methyl iodide (CH$_3$I), ethyl iodide (C$_2$H$_5$I),
propyl iodide (1- and 2-C$_3$H$_7$I), chloroiodomethane (CH$_2$ICl), bromoiodomethane (CH$_2$IBr), and
diiodomethane (CH$_2$I$_2$) (Butler et al., 2007; Carpenter, 2003; Jones et al., 2010; Mahajan et al.,
2012). However, these organic compounds contribute only up to a fourth of the MBL iodine
loading (Großmann et al., 2013; Jones et al., 2010; Mahajan et al., 2010a; Prados-Roman et al.,
2015b). Inorganic emissions of HOI and I$_2$, which result from the deposition of O$_3$ at the ocean
surface and subsequent reaction with I$^-$ ions in the surface microlayer, account for the main
source of iodine in the MBL (Carpenter et al., 2013). Recent laboratory experiments have shown
that HOI is the major compound emitted, and provided parameterizations of the fluxes of both
species depending on wind speed, temperature, and the concentrations of O$_3$ and I$^-$ (Carpenter et
al., 2013; MacDonald et al., 2014). These parameterized fluxes of HOI and I$_2$ have then been
used in a one-dimensional model to study the diurnal evolution of the IO and I$_2$ mixing ratios at
the Cape Verde Atmospheric Observatory (CVAO) (Carpenter et al., 2013; Lawler et al., 2014).
The model simulations replicate well the levels and general diurnal profiles of IO and I$_2$,
although an early morning ‘dawn spike’ in IO is predicted by the models, but has not been
observed (Mahajan et al., 2010a; Read et al., 2008). The morning peak predicted by current
iodine chemistry models is due to a buildup of the emitted I$_2$ and HOI (which is converted into
I$_2$/IBr/ICl through heterogeneous sea-salt recycling) over the course of the night, followed by
rapid photolysis at sunrise.

Traditionally it has been thought that iodine chemistry has a negligible effect on oxidizing
capability of the nocturnal marine atmosphere. As a consequence, unlike the demonstrated effect
of iodine on the levels of daytime oxidants, the impact of active iodine upon the main nighttime
oxidant, NO$_3$, remains an open question. This is important given that in many parts of the ocean
the NO$_3$ + DMS reaction is at least as important as OH + DMS in oxidizing DMS (Allan et al.,
2000), and hence a reduction of NO$_3$ may have an effect in the production of SO$_2$ and methane sulfonic acid (MSA). Here, we discuss possible mechanisms of nighttime iodine radical activation and their potential effect on nighttime iodine ocean fluxes and the currently modeled dawn spike in IO. A new reaction of HOI with NO$_3$ is proposed, supported by theoretical calculations. We explore the implications of this new reaction both for iodine and NO$_3$ chemistries.

2. Nocturnal iodine radical activation mechanism

We use the reaction mechanism that has recently been described in a global modelling study by Saiz-Lopez et al. (2014) (see supplementary information). In addition to the reactions included in that scheme, we also include nighttime gas-phase reactions based on the theoretical calculations described below. The additional reactions are listed in Table 1 and a scheme with this new nocturnal chemistry is included in Figure 1.

To the best of our knowledge, reactions of HOI specific to night time have not been studied, either theoretically or through laboratory experiments. Currently, HOI is thought to build up overnight until sunrise, with only heterogeneous uptake on seasalt aerosol as a nighttime loss process (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2012b; Simpson et al., 2015). In addition to the well known I$_2$ + NO$_3$ reaction (R1) (Chambers et al., 1992), here we consider several possible HOI reactions that could occur at night, in the absence of photolysis and OH:

\[
\text{HOI} + \text{NO}_2 \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{HNO}_3 \quad \text{(R2)}
\]

\[
\text{HOI} + \text{HNO}_3 \rightarrow \text{IONO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \text{(R3)}
\]
3. Theoretical calculations

In order to explore the feasibility of reactions 2–4 taking place under the conditions of the lower troposphere, we carried out electronic structure calculations using the hybrid density functional/Hartree-Fock B3LYP method from within the Gaussian 09 suite of programs (Frisch et al., 2009), combined with a G2 level basis set for I (Glukhovtsev et al., 1995) and the standard 6-311+g(2d,p) triple zeta basis set for O, N and H. Following geometry optimizations of the relevant points on the potential energy surfaces, and the determination of their corresponding vibrational frequencies and (harmonic) zero-point energies, energies relative to the reactants were obtained at the same level of theory. Spin-orbit corrections of -17 and -5 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) were applied to the energies of I and IO, respectively; these were estimated by comparing the theoretical and experimental bond energies of I\(_2\) and IO, calculated at the level of theory used in the present study, with available experimental data (Kaltsoyannis and Plane, 2008; Plane et al., 2006).

Reaction 2 is endothermic by 9 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) and so, within the expected error of ±10 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) at this level of theory, might be reasonably fast. However, the transition state of the reaction, which is illustrated in Figure 2(a), is 73 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) above the reactants and so this reaction will not occur at tropospheric temperatures. Reaction 3 is exothermic by 11 kJ mol\(^{-1}\). An HOI--HNO\(_3\) complex first forms (Figure 2(b)), which is 21 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) below the reactants. However, this complex rearranges to the IONO\(_2\) + H\(_2\)O products via the cyclic transition state shown in Figure 2(c), which is 110 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) above the reactants.
The stationary points on the potential energy surface (PES) for reaction 4 are illustrated in Figure 3. HOI and NO₃ associate to form a complex which is 24 kJ mol⁻¹ below the reactant entrance channel. H-atom transfer involves a submerged transition state to form a IO--HNO₃ complex, which can then dissociate to the products IO + HNO₃. Overall, the reaction is exothermic by 11 kJ mol⁻¹. The vibrational frequencies, rotational energies and geometries (in Cartesian co-ordinates) of these intermediates are listed in Table 2.

The rate coefficient for reaction 4 was then estimated using Rice-Ramsperger-Kassel-Markus (RRKM) theory, employing a multi-well energy-grained master equation solver based on the inverse Laplace transform method - MESMER (Master Equation Solver for Multi-well Energy Reactions) (Roberston et al., 2014). The reaction proceeds via the formation of the excited HOI--NO₃ complex from HOI + NO₃. This complex can then dissociate back to the reactants or rearrange to the IO--HNO₃ intermediate complex over the transition state, which can in turn dissociate to the products IO + HNO₃. Either of the intermediates can also be stabilized by collision with the third body (N₂). The time evolution of all these possible outcomes is modelled using the master equation.

The internal energies of the intermediates on the PES were divided into a contiguous set of grains (width 10 cm⁻¹), each containing a bundle of rovibrational states calculated with the molecular parameters in Table 2. It should be noted that the HOI-NO₃ and IO-HNO₃ complexes both have low frequency vibrational modes (< 100 cm⁻¹) which should more correctly be treated as hindered rotors rather than vibrations. However, in our experience this is not worth doing this until experimental rate coefficients are available to fit the rotor barrier heights. In any case, the energies of both complexes are far enough below the energy of the entrance channel (figure 3) that relatively small changes in their densities of states will have a minor effect on the overall
rate coefficient. Each grain was then assigned a set of microcanonical rate coefficients linking it to other intermediates, calculated by RRKM theory. For dissociation to products or reactants, microcanonical rate coefficients were determined using inverse Laplace transformation to link them directly to the capture rate coefficient, $k_{\text{capture}}$. For reaction 4 and the reverse reaction IO + HNO$_3$ involving neutral species, $k_{\text{capture}}$ was set to a typical capture rate coefficient of $2.5 \times 10^{-10} (T/300 \text{ K})^{1/6} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, where the small positive temperature dependence is characteristic of a long-range potential governed by dispersion and dipole-dipole forces (Georgievskii and Klippenstein, 2005).

The probability of collisional transfer between grains was estimated using the exponential down model, where the average energy for downward transitions was set to $<\Delta E>_{\text{down}} = 300 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for N$_2$ as the third body (Gilbert and Smith, 1990). MESMER determines the temperature- and pressure-dependent rate coefficient from the full microcanonical description of the system time evolution by performing an eigenvector/eigenvalue analysis (Bartis and Widom, 1974). The resulting rate coefficient over the temperature range 260 - 300 K at a pressure of 1000 hPa is $k_4(T) = 2.7 \times 10^{-12} (300 \text{ K} / T)^{2.66} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Because the intermediate complexes are not strongly bound, and the transition state and products are below the entrance channel, the only products formed in reaction 4 under atmospheric conditions are IO + HNO$_3$. The absence of a barrier above the entrance channel, and the fact that the intermediate complexes and barrier are well below the entrance channel within their uncertainties, means that the uncertainty in $k_4$ principally arises from the estimated capture rate coefficient and so is likely to be no more than a factor of 2.

Note that NO$_3$ also reacts with CH$_2$I$_2$ with a rate constant $\sim 2-4 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which can have a significant effect on nighttime CH$_2$I$_2$ concentration (Carpenter et al., 2015). However
the products of this reaction are still uncertain (Carpenter et al., 2015; Nakano et al., 2006) and its rate is considerably slower than that of R4.

In summary, the only likely gas-phase reactions that I$_2$ and HOI undergo in the nighttime troposphere are R1 and R4, respectively. These are included in the model reaction scheme to examine their impacts on the evolution of iodine species in the atmosphere.

4. Atmospheric modelling

We use two atmospheric chemical transport models to study i) the impact of this new chemistry on the nighttime chemistry and partitioning of iodine species, and ii) the resulting geographical distribution of nocturnal iodine and impact on NO$_3$ within the global marine boundary layer.

The first model, Tropospheric HALogen chemistry MOdel (THAMO), is used for a detailed kinetics study of the impact of the different reactions shown in Table 1 as well as to assess which uptake rates best reproduce observations from a field study at the CVAO (Carpenter et al., 2011). THAMO has been used in the past to study iodine chemistry at the CVAO and further details including the full chemical scheme can be found elsewhere (Lawler et al., 2014; Mahajan et al., 2009; Mahajan et al., 2010a; Mahajan et al., 2010b; Read et al., 2008; Saiz-Lopez et al., 2008).

Briefly, THAMO is a 1-D chemistry transport model with 200 stacked boxes at a vertical resolution of 5m (total height 1 km). The model treats iodine, bromine, O$_3$, NO$_x$ and HO$_x$ chemistry, and is constrained with typical measured values of other chemical species in the MBL: [CO]=110 nmol mol$^{-1}$; [DMS]=30 pmol/mol; [CH4]=1820 nmol mol$^{-1}$; [ethane]=925 pmol/mol; [CH3CHO]=970 pmol/mol; [HCHO]=500 pmol/mol; [isoprene]=10 pmol/mol; [propane]=60 pmol/mol; [propene]=20 pmol/mol. The average background aerosol surface area
(ASA) used is $1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ (Lee et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2010; Read et al., 2008; Read et al., 2009). The model is initialized at midnight and the evolution of iodine species, $O_3$, $NO_x$ and $HO_x$ is followed until the model reaches steady state.

The second model is the global 3D chemistry-climate model CAM-Chem (Community Atmospheric Model with chemistry, version 4.0), which is used to study the impact of reactions 1 and 4 on a global scale. The model includes a comprehensive chemistry scheme to simulate the evolution of trace gases and aerosols in the troposphere and the stratosphere (Lamarque et al., 2012). The model runs with the iodine and bromine chemistry schemes from previous studies (Fernandez et al., 2014; Saiz-Lopez et al., 2014; Saiz-Lopez et al., 2015), including the photochemical breakdown of bromo- and iodo-carbons emitted from the oceans (Ordóñez et al., 2012) and abiotic oceanic sources of HOI and I$_2$ (Prados-Roman et al., 2015a). CAM-Chem has been configured in this work with a horizontal resolution of 1.9º latitude by 2.5º longitude and 26 vertical levels, from the surface to ~40km altitude. All model runs in this study were performed in the specified dynamics mode (Lamarque et al., 2012) using offline meteorological fields instead of an online calculation, to allow direct comparisons between different simulations. This offline meteorology consists of a high frequency meteorological input from a previous free running climatic simulation.

It should be noted that during nighttime the uptake on aerosols of emitted species such as I$_2$ and HOI, and the uptake of reservoir species such as $IONO_2$, can play a major role in the cycling of iodine. Observations at CVAO show that I$_2$ peaked at about 1 pmol/mol during the night and that ICl was not detected above the 1 pmol/mol detection limit of the instrument (Lawler et al., 2014). In order to match these observations, we need to reduce the uptake and heterogeneous recycling of iodine species. The uptake rates of chemical species on the background seasalt
aerosols are determined by their uptake coefficients ($\gamma$). The database of mass accommodation and/or uptake coefficients is rather sparse and essentially limited to I$_2$, HI, HOI, ICI, IBr on pure water/ice and on sulphuric acid particles (Sander et al., 2006). Other iodine species which are likely to undergo uptake onto aerosol are OIO, HIO$_3$, INO$_2$, IONO$_2$, I$_2$O$_2$ (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2012a; Sommariva et al., 2012). Uptake of HOI is very uncertain, with $\gamma$(HOI) ranging from $2 \times 10^{-3}$ to 0.3 depending on the surface composition and state (Holmes et al., 2001). Sommariva et al. (2012) assumed $\gamma$(HOI) to be 0.6, similar to the value for HOBr measured by Wachsmuth et al. (2002). In the case of IONO$_2$, the uptake coefficient has not been measured, with most models using values of 0.1 (Lawler et al., 2014; Leigh et al., 2010; Mahajan et al., 2009; Mahajan et al., 2010a; Mahajan et al., 2010b; Saiz-Lopez et al., 2008; Sommariva et al., 2012; von Glasow et al., 2002). The modelled levels of I$_2$ and ICI change with different values of uptake coefficients. To match the CVAO I$_2$ and ICI observations (Lawler et al., 2014), we have used $\gamma = 0.01$ for HOI and IONO$_2$, which is within the uncertainty in the literature, and assumed that 80% is recycled as I$_2$. Further measurements of these dihalogen species are needed to better constrain their heterogeneous recycling on seasalt aerosols.

5. Results and discussion

Of the possible nocturnal iodine activation reactions involving the inorganic iodine source gases I$_2$ and HOI, only reactions R1 and R4 appear to be likely candidates (see Section 3). We therefore designed two modelling scenarios: Scenario 1 (S1), without nighttime reactions of I$_2$ or HOI with NO$_3$; and Scenario 2 (S2), including reactions R1 and R4 for the degradation of HOI and I$_2$ by NO$_3$. In the one-dimensional model THAMO, the I$_2$ and HOI are injected into the
atmosphere from the ocean surface using the flux parameterizations derived from laboratory experiments (Carpenter et al., 2013; MacDonald et al., 2014). Figure 4 shows the resulting diurnal evolution of the HOI and I₂ mixing ratios in the two scenarios. The I₂ mixing ratio peaks during the night in both the scenarios due to quick loss by photolysis during the daytime. By contrast, HOI is present during daytime due to its production through the reaction of IO with HO₂, and peaks just before sunset. In the first scenario, without the inclusion of reactions R1 and R4, Figure 4 (right-hand side panels) shows that HOI and I₂ both build up during the night, reaching a concentration peak just before dawn. This is especially noticeable for I₂ as the daytime concentrations are much lower than during the night. For both species, inclusion of reactions with NO₃ causes a decrease in their respective nocturnal concentrations (Fig. 4, left-hand side panels). The inclusion of reactions R1 and R4 also leads to a modelled I₂ concentration which is in better agreement with the observations of the molecule made at CVAO (Lawler et al., 2014), reaching peak values of about 1 pmol/mol, as compared to about 3 pmol/mol for the scenario without nighttime reactions. An additional consequence of including reactions R1 and R4 is the significant increase of the sea-air fluxes of HOI and I₂ at night due to their atmospheric removal by NO₃ (Fig. 4, bottom panel).

Figure 5 shows the diurnal evolution of IO, NO₃ and IONO₂ in both model scenarios. Although the daytime peak values of IO are well reproduced in both scenarios, reaching about 1.5 pmol/mol around noon similar to the ground-based observations (Read et al., 2008), the inclusion of reactions R1 and R4 leads to the removal of the dawn spike in IO, which is predicted by current iodine models but was not observed at CVAO (Mahajan et al., 2010a; Read et al., 2008). The IO dawn spike predicted by models is due to a buildup of the emitted I₂ and HOI (which is converted into I₂/IBr/ICl through heterogeneous recycling) over the night, followed by rapid
photolysis after first sunlight. However, due to the considerable removal of HOI and I\textsubscript{2} through
the night due to reaction with ambient NO\textsubscript{3}, this spike does not appear in the second scenario,
leading to a modification of the diurnal profile of IO that better matches with observations.

Reactions R1 and R4 also reduce the NO\textsubscript{3} mixing ratio (Fig. 5, middle panels). In scenario 1, the
NO\textsubscript{3} is modelled to peak at about 14 pmol/mol just before dawn. However, the inclusion of
reactions R1 and R4 leads to near complete depletion of NO\textsubscript{3} close to the surface, with the peak
level at the surface reaching only 2 pmol/mol, since reactions R1 and R4 become the main
atmospheric loss processes for NO\textsubscript{3} in the lower MBL. These reactions lead however to the
buildup of IONO\textsubscript{2} during the night (Fig. 5, bottom panels). In the absence of reactions R1 and
R4, significant levels of IONO\textsubscript{2} are seen only at dawn and dusk since no other reactions produce
IONO\textsubscript{2} at night, and during the day IONO\textsubscript{2} is removed by photolysis. However, with continuous
conversion of I\textsubscript{2} and HOI to IONO\textsubscript{2} by reactions R1 and R4 in scenario 2, IONO\textsubscript{2} is modelled to
reach up to 3 pmol/mol in the nocturnal MBL.

Given the associated uncertainty in the theoretical estimate of the $k_4$, we used THAMO to assess
the sensitivity of surface NO\textsubscript{3} to $k_4$. Figure 6 shows that NO\textsubscript{3} is in fact highly coupled to $k_4$, with
the expected uncertainty in $k_4$ of one order of magnitude (see above) giving rise to a factor of two
change in NO\textsubscript{3}. A laboratory measurement of $k_4$ should therefore be undertaken in the future.

We now implement the nighttime reactions in the 3D global model (CAM-Chem) to assess the
resulting geographical distributions and impacts of these reactions. We have also run two
different scenarios in CAM-Chem, the first without R1 and R4 in the chemical scheme, and the
second including the new nighttime iodine chemistry. Figure 7 shows how the inclusion of R1
and R4 reduces globally the nighttime concentrations of I\textsubscript{2} and HOI. The plots correspond to the
nighttime averaged (from 00LT to 01LT) differences between the model scenarios. Considerable reductions of up to 0.5 and 10 pmol/mol (i.e. up to 100% removal) are observed for I\(_2\) and HOI, respectively, particularly over coastal polluted regions where continental pollution outflow leads to higher levels of NO\(_3\) in the nighttime MBL. Major shipping routes also show strong nocturnal iodine activity due to the characteristically high NO\(_x\), and resulting NO\(_3\), associated with shipping emissions.

Figure 8 shows the effect of this nocturnal chemistry on the concentrations of IONO\(_2\) and NO\(_3\). As in the previous figure, the plots correspond to the nighttime averaged difference between the second and the first scenarios. The maps show an increase of IONO\(_2\) of up to 15 pmol/mol (~600%) over polluted coastal areas, due to efficient conversion of NO\(_3\) into IONO\(_2\). The bottom panel of Figure 7 shows the expected decrease of NO\(_3\) levels associated with the inclusion of reactions R1 and R4, with decreases of up to ~4 pmol/mol (up to 60%) over marine polluted regions. We model global percentage reductions in the NO\(_3\) concentrations of 7.1% (60S-60N), with nitrate removal of up to 80% in non-polluted remote oceanic regions with low NO\(_3\) levels. This in turn can affect the modelled oxidation of DMS by NO\(_3\). We estimate that the reduction in NO\(_3\), due to the inclusion of R1 and R4, results in a model increase in DMS levels of up to 7 pmol/mol (about 20%) in marine regions affected by continental pollution outflow (Fig. 9). We therefore suggest that the inclusion of the new nighttime iodine chemistry can have a large, so far unrecognized, impact on the nocturnal oxidizing capacity of the marine atmosphere.

The hourly evolution of the main species involved in this study is shown in Figures 10 and 11, which include the levels of HOI, I\(_2\), IONO\(_2\) and NO\(_3\) in the MBL over regions where nocturnal iodine is modelled to be particularly active. The first region is located within the Mediterranean Sea, an area that shows large differences during the summer months when high ozone levels...
drive large emissions of HOI and I$_2$ from the sea, and the high levels of NO$_3$ at nighttime make this chemistry especially important. The hourly average in August is shown in Figure 10 for HOI, IONO$_2$ and I$_2$. HOI and IONO$_2$ (Fig 10) are the species whose concentration differ most between scenarios as HOI is removed and IONO$_2$ produced by R4 (and, to a lesser extent, R1). Over a Pacific Ocean region at the south of the Baja California Peninsula, the modelled differences between the two scenarios are even higher than over the Mediterranean Sea (Figure 11). Large differences in MBL NO$_3$, up to 28%, are modelled during the night caused by pollution outflow from the west coasts of Mexico and USA.

6. Summary and conclusions

The viability of the reaction of HOI with NO$_2$, HNO$_3$ and NO$_3$ has been studied by theoretical calculations. The results indicate that only the reaction of HOI with NO$_3$, to yield IO + HNO$_3$, is possible under tropospheric conditions. The inclusion of this reaction, along with that of I$_2$ + NO$_3$, has a number of significant implications: i) nocturnal iodine radical chemistry is activated; ii) this causes enhanced nighttime oceanic emissions of HOI and I$_2$; iii) nighttime iodine species are partitioned into high levels of IONO$_2$; iv) the IO spike, modelled by current iodine models but not shown by observations, is removed; and, v) a reduction of the levels of nitrate radical in the MBL, with the associated less efficient oxidation of DMS, which has important implications for our understanding of the nocturnal oxidizing capacity of the marine atmosphere.
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Table 1: Night time reactions of emitted inorganic iodine compounds considered in addition to the iodine chemistry scheme used by (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.</td>
<td>$\text{I}_2 + \text{NO}_3 \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{IONO}_2$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ [Chambers et al., 1992]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.</td>
<td>HOI + NO$_2 \rightarrow$ I + HNO$_3$</td>
<td>Endothermic by 9 kJ mol$^{-1}$ and the transition state is 73 kJ mol$^{-1}$ above the reactants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.</td>
<td>HOI + HNO$_3 \rightarrow$ IONO$_2$ + H$_2$O</td>
<td>Exothermic by 11 kJ mol$^{-1}$. The reaction first forms a complex 21 kJ mol$^{-1}$ below the reactants but this rearranges to the products via a transition state that is 110 kJ mol$^{-1}$ above the reactants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R4. | HOI + NO$_3 \rightarrow$ IO + HNO$_3$ | Exothermic by 11 kJ mol$^{-1}$ with all transition states below the reactants. 

\[ k(T) = 2.7 \times 10^{-12} (300 \text{ K}/T)^{2.66} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \]
Table 2. Calculated vibrational frequencies, rotational constants and energies of the stationary points and asymptotes on the HOI + NO₃ doublet potential energy surface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Vibrational frequencies</th>
<th>Rotational constants</th>
<th>Potential energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOI + NO₃</td>
<td></td>
<td>603, 1084, 3803 &amp; 261, 261, 805, 1108, 1108, 1126</td>
<td>623.9, 8.182, 8.076 &amp; 13.84, 13.84, 6.919</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOH-NO₃ complex</td>
<td>O 1.623, 0.284, -0.331</td>
<td>55, 84, 118, 161, 196, 615, 629, 667, 705, 803, 968, 1228, 1273, 1491, 3268</td>
<td>5.610, 0.916, 0.806</td>
<td>-24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO-H-NO₂ TS</td>
<td>O 0.309, 1.515, 0.247</td>
<td>1249, 70, 97, 103, 225, 472, 676, 698, 797, 806, 1041, 1147, 1308, 1513, 1626</td>
<td>6.300, 0.864, 0.767</td>
<td>-16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO-HNO₃ complex</td>
<td>O 0.571, 1.350, 0.348</td>
<td>35, 43, 76, 126, 198, 623, 677, 703, 772, 798, 939, 1331, 1416, 1713, 3281</td>
<td>7.058, 0.605, 0.566</td>
<td>-34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO + HNO₃</td>
<td></td>
<td>648 &amp; 477, 585, 649, 782, 901, 1320, 1345, 1738, 3724</td>
<td>9.844 &amp; 13.01, 12.05, 6.258</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Cartesian co-ordinates in Å. b In cm⁻¹. c In GHz. d In kJ mol⁻¹, including zero-point energy and spin-orbit coupling of I and IO (see text).
Figure 1. New nocturnal iodine chemistry (in white) implemented in the THAMO and CAM-Chem models.
Figure 2: (a) Transition state for the reaction between HOI and NO₂ to form HNO₃ + I; (b) complex formed between HOI and HNO₃, which then reacts via transition state (c) to form IONO₂ + H₂O.
Figure 3. Potential energy surface for the reaction between HOI and NO$_3$, which contains two intermediate complexes separated by a submerged barrier.
Figure 4. THAMO modeled diurnal variation of HOI, I$_2$ (upper panels) and the HOI/I$_2$ flux from the ocean surface (bottom panel). The right hand panels are from scenario 1, which do not include night time reactions of HOI and I$_2$ with NO$_3$, while the left hand panels include the reactions in scenario 2. In bottom panel red lines represent scenario 1, while black lines correspond to scenario 2.
Figure 5. THAMO modeled diurnal variation of IO, NO₃ and the IONO₂. The right hand panels are from scenario 1, which do not include night time reactions of HOI and I₂ with NO₃, while the left hand panels include the reactions in scenario 2.
Figure 6. Sensitivity run showing the effect of the uncertainty in the rate constant estimation on the reduction of NO$_3$ at the surface - the red point is the theoretical estimate.
Figure 7. Modelled annual average of HOI (a) and I$_2$ (b) during night time at the surface level. The panels show the difference in volume mixing ratio between the simulations with and without reactions (1) and (4).
Figure 8. Modelled annual average of IONO$_2$ (a) and NO$_3$ (b) during night time at the surface level, as the difference in volume mixing ratio between the simulations with and without reactions (1) and (4).
Figure 9. Increase in the DMS levels during night time at the surface level due to the inclusion of the reactions R1 and R4 in CAM-Chem.
Figure 10. Hourly averaged concentration of HOI, IONO₂ and I₂ in the Mediterranean Sea at the surface level (lon:10°→20°E, lat:33°→40°N)
Figure 11. Hourly averaged concentration of HOI, IONO$_2$ and I$_2$ (upper panel) and NO$_3$ (bottom panel) in the Pacific Ocean at the south of Baja California peninsula at the surface level (lon: $-110^\circ$→$-106^\circ$E, lat:$16^\circ$→$23^\circ$N)
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## Table 1. Iodine chemistry scheme in CAM-Chem: Bimolecular, thermal decomposition and termolecular reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I} + \text{O}_3 \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$2.1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(-830 / T)}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{O}_3 \rightarrow \text{OIO} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$3.6 \times 10^{-16}$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I} + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{HI} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(-1090 / T)}$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{NO}_2$</td>
<td>$7.15 \times 10^{-12} \text{ e}^{(300 / T)}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{HOI} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$1.4 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(540 / T)}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{IO} \rightarrow \text{I}_2 + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$2.13 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(1800/T)} \times [1 + \text{e}^{(-p / 191.42)}]$</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{IO} \rightarrow \text{I}_2 + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$3.27 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(180 / T)} \times [1 - 0.65 \text{e}^{(-p / 191.42)}]$</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{OIO} \rightarrow \text{I}_2 \text{O}_3$</td>
<td>$w_1 \cdot \text{exp} \left( w_2 \cdot T \right)$</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{OIO} + \text{OIO} \rightarrow \text{I}_2 \text{O}_4$</td>
<td>$w_1 \cdot \text{exp} \left( w_2 \cdot T \right)$</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I}_2 + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{I}$</td>
<td>$1.25 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$1.4 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{HOI} + \text{O}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I}_2 \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{OIO} + \text{I}$</td>
<td>$w_1 \cdot \text{exp} \left( w_2 / T \right)$</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I}_2 \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{IO}$</td>
<td>$w_1 \cdot \text{exp} \left( w_2 / T \right)$</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I}_2 \text{O}_4 \rightarrow 2 \text{OIO}$</td>
<td>$w_1 \cdot \text{exp} \left( w_2 / T \right)$</td>
<td>5, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I}_2 + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{HOI} + \text{I}$</td>
<td>$1.8 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I}_2 + \text{NO}_3 \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{IONO}_2$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I} + \text{NO}_3 \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{NO}_2$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{OH} + \text{HI} \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(440 / T)}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I} + \text{IONO}_2 \rightarrow \text{I}_2 + \text{NO}_3$</td>
<td>$9.1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(146 / T)}$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HOI} + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$</td>
<td>$2.0 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{DMS} \rightarrow \text{DMSO} + \text{I}$</td>
<td>$3.2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ e}^{(-925 / T)}$</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IONO}_2 \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{NO}_2$</td>
<td>$1008 \times 10^{15} \text{ e}^{(-13670 / T)}$</td>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IONO}_2 \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{NO}_2$</td>
<td>$w_1 \cdot \text{exp} \left( w_2 / T \right)$</td>
<td>5, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{INO} + \text{INO} \rightarrow \text{I}_2 + 2\text{NO}$</td>
<td>$8.4 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(2620 / T)}$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{INO}_2 + \text{INO}_2 \rightarrow \text{I}_2 + 2\text{NO}_2$</td>
<td>$4.7 \times 10^{-13} \text{ e}^{(1670 / T)}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{OIO} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{NO}_2$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-12} \text{ e}^{(542 / T)}$</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HI} + \text{NO}_3 \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{HNO}_3$</td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^{-12} \text{ e}^{(1830 / T)}$</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{BrO} \rightarrow \text{Br} + \text{I} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$0.30 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(510 / T)}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{IO} + \text{BrO} \rightarrow \text{Br} + \text{OIO}$</td>
<td>$1.20 \times 10^{-11} \text{ e}^{(510 / T)}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{I} + \text{BrO} \rightarrow \text{IO} + \text{Br}$</td>
<td>$1.44 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>17, 18, 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IO + ClO → I + OClO $2.585 \times 10^{-12} e^{(280/T)}$ 1
IO + ClO → I + Cl + O2 $1.175 \times 10^{-12} e^{(280/T)}$ 1
IO + ClO → ICl + O2 $0.940 \times 10^{-12} e^{(280/T)}$ 1
IO + Br → I + BrO $2.49 \times 10^{11}$ 18, 19
IO + NO3 → OIO + NO2 $9.0 \times 10^{-12}$ 20
IO + CH3O2 → CH2O + I + HO2 $2.0 \times 10^{-12}$ 2
CH3I + OH → I + H2O + HO2 $2.90 \times 10^{-12} e^{(-1100/T)}$ 3
I + NO2 (+ M) → INO2 (+ M)
   $k_0 = 3 \times 10^{-31} \times (T / 300)^{-1}$ 3
   $k_\infty = 6.6 \times 10^{-11}$ 3
IO + NO2 (+ M) → IONO2 (+ M)
   $k_0 = 6.5 \times 10^{-31} \times (T / 300)^{3.5}$ 3
   $k_\infty = 7.6 \times 10^{-12} \times (T / 300)^{1.5}$ 3
I + NO (+ M) → INO (+ M)
   $k_0 = 1.8 \times 10^{-32} \times (T / 300)^{1}$ 3
   $k_\infty = 1.7 \times 10^{-11}$ 3
OIO + OH (+ M) → HOIO2 (+ M)
   $k_0 = 1.5 \times 10^{-27} \times (T / 300)^{3.93}$ 14
   $k_\infty = 7.76 \times 10^{-10} \times (T / 300)^{-0.8}$ 14
HOI + NO3 → IO + HNO3 $2.7 \times 10^{-12} (300/T)^{2.66}$ 21

1 IUPAC-2008 (Atkinson et al., 2007); 2 (Dillon et al., 2006b); 3 JPL-2010 (Sander et al., 2011); 4 (Gómez Martín et al., 2007); 5 (Kaltsoyannis and Plane, 2008); 6 (Galvez et al., 2013); 7 (Bösch et al., 2003); 8 (Gómez Martín and Plane, 2009); 9 (Chambers et al., 1992); 10 (Chameides and Davis, 1980); 11 (Dillon et al., 2006a); 12 (McFiggans et al., 2000); 13 (Jenkin et al., 1985); 14 (Plane et al., 2006); 15 (Allan and Plane, 2002); 16 (Lancar et al., 1991); 17 (Laszlo et al., 1997); 18 (Bedjanian et al., 1997); 19 (Gilles et al., 1997); 20 (Dillon et al., 2008); 21 This work.

\[ a \]
\[ w_1 = 4.687 \times 10^{-10} - 1.3855 \times 10^{-5} \times e^{(-0.75 p / 1.62265)} + 5.51868 \times 10^{-10} \times e^{(-0.75 p / 199.328)} \]
\[ w_2 = -0.00331 - 0.00514 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 325.68711)} - 0.00444 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 40.81609)} \]

\[ b \]
\[ w_1 = 1.1659 \times 10^{-9} - 7.79644 \times 10^{-10} \times e^{(-0.75 p / 22.09281)} + 1.03779 \times 10^{-9} \times e^{(-0.75 p / 568.15381)} \]
\[ w_2 = -0.00813 - 0.00382 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 45.57591)} - 0.00643 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 417.95061)} \]

\[ c \]
\[ w_1 = 3.54288 \times 10^{-10} + 1.8523 \times 10^{-11} \times 0.75 p - 1.45435 \times 10^{8} \times (0.75p)^{2} + 60799.4344 \times (0.75p)^{2} \]
\[ w_2 = -9681.65989 + 346.95538 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 343.25322)} + 251.78032 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 44.1466)} \]

\[ d \]
\[ w_1 = 255335000000 - 44188800000 \times 0.75 p + 856186000 \times (0.75 p)^{2} + 14218.81 \times (0.75 p)^{3} \]
\[ w_2 = -11466.82304 + 597.0.1334 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 1382.62325)} - 167.3391 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 43.75089)} \]

\[ e \]
\[ w_1 = -1.92626 \times 10^{14} + 4.67414 \times 10^{13} \times 0.75 p - 3.68651 \times 10^{8} \times (0.75 p)^{2} - 3.09109 \times 10^{6} \times (0.75 p)^{3} \]
\[ w_2 = -12302.15294 + 252.78367 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 46.12733)} + 437.62868 \times e^{(-0.75 p / 428.4413)} \]
\[w_1 = -2.63544 \times 10^{13} + 4.32845 \times 10^{12} \times (0.75 \ p) + 3.73758 \times 10^8 \times (0.75 \ p)^2 - 628468.76313 \times (0.75 \ p)^3\]
\[w_2 = -13847.85015 + 240.34465 \times e^{(-0.75 \ p / 49.27141)} + 451.35864 \times e^{(-0.75 \ p / 436.87605)}\]

The empirical expressions of the form \(w_1 \cdot \exp (w_2 \cdot T)\) were obtained by nonlinear least squares fitting of Rice–Ramsperger–Kassel–Marcus (RRKM) theoretical results for the indicated reaction rate constants and thermal dissociation rates in the \((27 – 1013)\) hPa pressure range. RRKM calculations were carried out using the MESMER algorithm (Glowacki et al., 2012) as indicated in the corresponding references (e.g. (Galvez et al., 2013)). Expression \(g\) produces negative values outside the range of modelled rate constants \((p < 20 \ hPa)\), and therefore a fixed rate constant of \(3 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\) was assumed. Expressions \(e\) and \(f\) generate negligible dissociation rates below \(~500 \ hPa\) which become negative at \(~8 \ hPa\) – in this case they are set to zero below that pressure.

Updated heats of formation for IO, OIO, and CH₃O₂ (Dooley et al., 2008; Gómez Martín and Plane, 2009; Knyazev and Slagle, 1998) show that the only accessible exothermic product channel of CH₃O₂ + IO (Drougas and Kosmas, 2007) is \(\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{I} + \text{O}_2 (\Delta H_r = -5 \pm 6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1})\), consistent with the high yield of I and low yield of OIO found experimentally (Bale et al., 2005; Enami et al., 2006). Sensitivity studies have been carried out (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2014) using the preferred rate constant for this reaction of \(2 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\) (Dillon et al., 2006b), resulting in an enhancement of the ozone loss of \(0.5\%\) in the MBL and of less than \(0.1\%\) integrated throughout the troposphere in the J₁ₓOₓ scenario, and similarly negligible enhancements in the Base scenario. Impacts in the Iₓ partitioning are also very minor.

The temperature and pressure dependent rate constant \((k)\) is computed based on the low pressure \((k_0)\) and the high-pressure \((k_{\infty})\) rate coefficients following JPL-2010 (Sander et al., 2011).

The Fast rate constants and a thermally stable product HOIO₂ have been predicted theoretically (Plane et al., 2006), but no experimental studies reporting observation of HOIO₂ and its photochemical properties in the gas phase are available. Since the level of uncertainty is even larger than for the IₓOₓ, it has not been included in the mechanism.
Table 2. Iodine chemistry scheme in CAM-Chem: Photochemical reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$I + hν → CH$_3$O$_2$ + I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_2$I$_2$ + hν → 2I $^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_2$IBr + hν → Br + I $^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_2$ICl + hν → Cl + I $^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$_2$ + hν → 2I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO + hν → I + O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIO + hν → I + O$_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INO + hν → I + NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INO$_2$ + hν → I + NO$_2$ $^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IONO$_2$ + hν → I + NO$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOI + hν → I + OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBr + hν → I + Br</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICl + hν → I + Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$_2$O$_2$ + hν → I + OIO $^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$_2$O$_3$ + hν → IO + OIO $^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$_2$O$_4$ + hν → OIO + OIO $^c$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photolysis rates are computed online considering the actinic flux calculation in CAM-Chem. The absorption cross-sections and quantum yields for all species besides the I$_x$O$_y$ have been taken from IUPAC-2008 (Atkinson et al., 2007; Atkinson et al., 2008) and JPL-2010 (Sander et al., 2011).

$^a$ radical organic products are not considered.

$^b$ only the reaction channel reported in JPL 06-02 (Sander et al., 2006) is considered.

$^c$ photolysis reactions only considered in the $J_{I_xO_y}$ scheme (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2014).
Table 3. Iodine chemistry scheme in CAM-Chem: Heterogeneous reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sea-salt aerosol reactions</th>
<th>Reactive uptake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IONO₂ → 0.5 IBr + 0.5 ICl</td>
<td>γ = 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INO₂ → 0.5 IBr + 0.5 ICl</td>
<td>γ = 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOI → 0.5 IBr + 0.5 ICl</td>
<td>γ = 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I₂O₂ →</td>
<td>γ = 0.01(^\text{§})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I₂O₃ →</td>
<td>γ = 0.01(^\text{§})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I₂O₄ →</td>
<td>γ = 0.01(^\text{§})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values based on the THAMO model (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2008) and implemented in CAM-Chem following (Ordóñez et al., 2012).

\(^\text{§}\) Deposition of IₓOᵧ species on sea-salt aerosols has been included following the free regime approximation.
Table 4. Iodine chemistry scheme in CAM-Chem: Henry’s Law constants and dry deposition velocities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>$k_0$ (M atm$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Deposition velocity§ (cm s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBr$^{ice}$</td>
<td>$2.4 \times 10^1$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICl$^{ice}$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^2$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>$7.8 \times 10^{-1}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOI – ($J_{IxOy}$/Base)</td>
<td>$1.9 \times 10^3 / 4.5 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IONO$_2^{ice}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INO$_2^{ice}$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>$4.5 \times 10^2$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIO</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$_2$O$_2$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$_2$O$_4$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ Dry deposition velocities are based on the THAMO model (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2008).

1 Values reported in (Sander, 1999).

2 Values based on the THAMO model (Saiz-Lopez et al., 2008).

$a$ Considering a dissociation constant $K_a = 3.2 \times 10^9$ and a temperature dependent coefficient $c = 9800$ K

$b$ Within the range of values given in the corresponding reference.

$c$ Virtually infinite solubility is represented by using a very large arbitrary number.

$d$ Value assumed to be equal to those of BrNO$_2$.

$^{ice}$ Species for which ice-uptake is considered following (Neu and Prather, 2012).
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