

# ***Interactive comment on “A re-evaluated Canadian ozonesonde record: measurements of the vertical distribution of ozone over Canada from 1966 to 2013” by D. W. Tarasick et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 16 July 2015

The purpose of this paper is to homogenize the Canadian ozonesonde record, following the latest guidance from various sources within the ozonesonde community. Given the many changes that have occurred to the ozonesonde instrument over the last 40 years, such an effort is needed. The authors seek to systematically discuss and then to quantify each of the possible sources of error in the measurement of ozone. Thus providing the necessary uncertainty associated with each ozone measurement throughout a profile. Then with all of this homogenized data the authors want to present all of the Canadian data and discuss trends.

These are all useful goals and necessary work; however, the presentation and discus-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



sion of trends is off the main topic of the paper, detracts from the main thrust, and gets lost in the process. The title does not include anything about trends, nor should it. I recommend that the section on trends become a second paper, so that here the authors take the time and space to fully explain how the ozone record is homogenized.

Unfortunately the authors skim over most of these details. They assume all readers are intimately familiar with every last subtlety of an ozonesonde measurement, will excuse sloppy language and missing detail, don't mind that acronyms are not defined, that companion plots are not presented together in multi-panel figures, that relevant literature is not cited, or that results are a little confusing. This reviewer is not willing to accept this as a standard for ozonesonde literature. Thus the many questions and points that follow here and the recommendation that the paper is not of an acceptable standard for publication. It needs a major revision to supply the detail skipped in this first draft, and which leads to the many questions which follow below.

Major issues:

One major disappointment of this paper is that the authors do not bother to show how the ozone normalization factor, and the relevant uncertainties in the measurements, changed from pre-homogenization to post-homogenization. They make the point both early, and in the conclusions, that there was real improvement, but do not bother to show one of the major results of this work. This could also be real motivation for other ozonesonde scientists to homogenize their own data sets. Following that line, one example of a station's long term trend for the pre- and post-homogenized data would be highly interesting. Did it make a difference? Was it worth doing, or is there minimal impact on the trends? Several times the authors hint that there is minimal impact on trends, to keep alive previous literature based on trends in the Canadian ozonesonde data, but they do not provide the example graphs to drive this point home, which is important.

5217.1-5. This first sentence is better, but still doesn't work. I had to read it three times

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



to understand the intent. Make it two sentences, breaking it when stratospheric ozone is discussed.

5217-second paragraph. The literature cited is highly uneven. Why on some important topics is one reference “and references therein” provided, whereas for other topics up to 7 citations, prefaced with e.g., are included? The 7 citations beg the e.g. Use a balanced approach, and do the work if you don’t know the references. Check out the paper where they are found. An even distribution of references would help the argument as to the importance of the network.

5218.9-15. ECC is not a word. I believe there are some references associated with the development of this instrument, which could be useful (and it was not Tarasick). Note that Brewer-Mast sondes received such respect, and they are no longer used. Later in the paragraph we find there has been three decades of work and minor changes for the ECC, and not one reference!

5219.1-18. Is this the operating principle of all ozonesondes, or is this chemistry particular to one type? Where is the number, given to 4 significant figures, in equation 1 from? It results from well-known physical constants which should be used in spite of what Komhyr published. The equation could also benefit from using flow rate rather than “time to pump 100 ml”, which is flow rate upside down. The formulation of the equation as it is shown, and specifying the units of the quantities, is operator manual stuff, not scientific paper stuff. If the equation is presented scientifically, units don’t have to be presented. They will be universal and the detail only necessary when the equation is applied, which is not here. I’m not even sure what “kelvins” are. What are “bias changes”?

5220.14-23. How is the climatology of McPeters and Labow used to renormalize? The climatology is used to extrapolate the sounding from ceiling to top of atmosphere. Then the sonde total column is normalized to a total ozone measurement. There are three steps. First the total ozone record is corrected, second the integrals of the ozone

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



soundings are corrected with the climatology, and then the two are compared to provide finally a normalization factor for the sounding. This paragraph could be clearer. Turn it around so the correction to the soundings is discussed first, then the integration, then the total ozone data, just as it is done in practice.

2.2 Why no mention of the work done by the Swiss with their Brewer Mast record, Stubi e al.?

5222.25. Even though the absolute concentration differences could be considered minor, it is a factor of 2 difference in concentration of KI, which is not exactly minor.

2.6 Were the corrections were made following Smit et al.? That is the corrections were spelled out in Smit et al.? If so state it, otherwise the correction details should be spelled out here.

2.7 This section contains a surprise not mentioned in 2.6. The “box” temperature, or other interior temperature, is unavailable before 1999. That is pretty recent. Why are we then talking about pump temperature measurements for sensors 3A and 4A which were in use before 1999, and which thus could also not be corrected?

This also raises another question. Is the Canadian network homogenization dependent on the WOUDC for its data records? I would have expected that they had more complete records at each station where a measurement was made. The WOUDC is merely a data archive for the finished product. The authors need to be clear about what data are used in this homogenization project. Is it all based on only what is available from the WOUDC, or are there other sources?

5224.21-5225.4. I doubt that these day to night differences are the result of the pressure sensor which should not have a diurnal component, but rather to poor temperature measurements due to some deficiencies in handling radiation on the temperature sensor. This needs to be made clear whether the authors are ascribing this diurnal difference to the pressure sensors and if so why.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



I don't understand the rationale for the one sentence paragraph beginning, "Pressure errors ...", nor why the agreement of the local noon flights suggest that the pressure errors are more variable. These two paragraphs need to be combined and made more intelligible. What exactly is being claimed? How are these differences ascribed only to the pressure sensor and not to issues also in temperature? How is it possible to separate pressure and temperature if the comparison is between the calculated altitude from the sonde and an external altitude reference such as a radar or gps.

2.8. This sub section is longer than practically any other sub section in section 2, yet the end result is that nothing can be done, because of the difficulties inherent in the changes, and their unknown final impact on any individual sonde. Does the reader really need all the detail? Not this reader. I would prefer to see this section summarized much more succinctly, and a statement right at the beginning to indicate that none of what follows will be used in the correction of the data, other than as a source of uncertainty. Then spell out what that uncertainty will be and how it will be incorporated, e.g. as an uncertainty on sonde height based on year/day/night/..., or ...

Figures 1-4. These should be combined into one 4 panel plot, so they can be compared easily. The legends are not clear. What is the difference between renormalized and normalized, what do the labels, TARASICK et al., MATEER, DESCHLER (sic) refer to, why are some labels in all caps and other upper and lower case? Here it shows temperature corrections throughout the profile for ECC sondes in the 1980s, whereas earlier it was claimed the temperature profiles were not available for data prior to 1999. How can these facts be reconciled? It seems the numbers on the abscissae are off by  $10^5$ . People usually don't display ozone partial pressure in hPa.

5226.18-23. Why isn't a temporal history of these normalization factors shown for the Canadian record? This would be quite interesting, and a good indication of the usefulness and impact of the corrections. In fact a before and after graph would be very illustrative of the usefulness of the corrections and the stability of the Canadian measurements.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



4.3 Pump calibration. It is not clear if this just means flow rate measurement, or pump calibration to determine efficiency as a function of pressure. The paragraph suggests the former, the title the latter. Pumps are not calibrated for a fixed flow rate, rather the flow rate is just measured.

4.4 Confusing. What graduated cylinder? What is at 100% RH, the cylinder or the air being expelled? What is the uncertainty then on: the flow rate, the pump calibration, the ozone sensed? This paragraph may only be understood by those intimate with making ozone measurements, all others forget it.

4.5 Is the 0.5% just a guess, or is there some basis, and if a guess how so accurate?

5228.19-20. What latter seven lines? Do the authors mean the latter seven items in the list, but there were only 5. Is the reader to count back seven lines? Do the authors mean the next 7 items? Is it too difficult for the authors to list the items with errors varying throughout the profile? If the errors vary is that indicated in Table 4, and then how can a constant error be stated? How is the variation with altitude handled?

4.6 Now we're back to pumps. Why aren't 4.3 and 4.6 at least grouped together? What is meant by pump correction and its error? The uninformed reader will again not know what is being discussed, or that it has a pressure dependence, until maybe the last line. What larger values have been averaged? If I am correct the corrections to flow rate at low pressure can be significant, > 10% at 10 hPa. Table 4 indicates just about 3% at 10 hPa. The authors need to clarify this section.

4.7 Can the 2.5 mL bias the measurement high? According to the explanation it only misses ozone, it doesn't add it. So why the plus/minus 4%? What is the pressure dependence?

4.8 Why is the difference randomly variable? One is a constant, the other pressure dependent, thus it shouldn't be random, but decay smoothly as pressure decreases. To indicate why it is always positive mention that the pressure dependent part is pro-

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

portional to the ratio of pressure with surface pressure. This is a poor way to introduce Figures 5-8 which are showing more than the effect of the background current, and finally the graphs do not show an average magnitude, rather an uncertainty that has a profile which is not easily averaged.

Figures 5-8. These should be combined into one 4 panel plot so the reader can see the changes easily. How many of these uncertainties are two sided? What do the JOSIE ECC/BM, Vanscoy ECC labels refer to? These figures need to be introduced more properly, rather than off hand in one item in section 4. They can then be used when some of the items already discussed are described. Their introduction doesn't come until much later. Why are the ordinates not shown, only the tick marks? If their introduction is to be delayed then don't mention them in section 4.8.

4.9 I doubt that many besides the authors, and I am not sure all of them, understand what is done for this correction. This paper's readers will certainly not understand it.

4.10 What is the empirical estimate based on? At least here the pressure dependence is specified. Why is solution evaporation more important in Brewer Mast than in ECC sondes?

4.11 It is hard to reconcile this section with table 4, where the ascent rate variation is  $\pm 12\% \cdot \exp(\Delta t / \tau_{\text{sub O}_3})$ , whatever the quantities in the exponent mean. They are not explained. Yet here in the text it is a "modest ( $< 1\%$ )". Why are these errors modest while previous errors of 0.5% are specified? Are they modest as well?

4.12 What are the values of the manufacturer's 1 sigma uncertainty? What is multiplied by the ozone gradient? Why is the ozone gradient used? If the manufacturer's 1 sigma uncertainties are used what values from Richner and Phillips and Steinbrecht et al. are used?

5230.17-5231.9, Figures 5-8. So now the figures are introduced, but there are questions reconciling them with table 4.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



1) The only corrections explicitly shown are pump correction error and background current, and if these two were added together they should come close the “same balloon” and their difference with the “same balloon” should indicate the impact of all the other errors, but they don’t. In Figures 6-8 the sum of the pump correction error and the background current exceeds the same balloon. In fig. 6 at the top of the profile there is only 1% difference between background current and same balloon, while the pump correction factor is 4%.

2) If the errors in any column in Table 4 are added except for the pump correction and background current they would be in the range of 6%, e.g. 5A/6A, with the major contribution from the 2.5ml solution error, while the pump correction is 1-3% (so stated) and the background current error range not easily displayed, but from the graphs it is on the order of 6% and less. So why then isn’t there a bigger separation between same balloon and the sum of pump correction and background current. The figures cannot be resolved with the table.

3) How many errors are double sided? It would be good to replot the data allowing all two sided errors to go both ways with zero on the abscissa in the middle. Then for example the 2.5 ml error would only show up on the right, as would, if I understand the text correctly, the background current. How about pump correction? Table 4 indicates all errors are two sided, but I don’t believe that is the case.

4) Why, since the background current error is always positive  $ib \cdot (1 - P/P_o)$  is there such a large bump near 10 km? Is that because the ozone is lowest just below the tropopause? It would be useful to indicate this with some climatological temperature profile shown, so the reader knows how the errors are distributed between troposphere and stratosphere. But this illustrates the point that the percent error is dependent on the ozone profile itself. Still it is curious why the other factors, comprising a 6% error don’t appear more strongly.

5232.15-20. If I understand correctly these are natural halogens, bromine, inducing the

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



ozone loss, so why should the frequency change?

5232.26-29. This statement on stratospheric ozone recovery is incorrect. No one expects to see ozone recovery in the 2000-2013 time frame. Stratospheric chlorine levels, even though declining, are still well above the point where recovery could be seen. Note that this statement is belied by the next two sentences which highlight ozone loss in the cold vortex years.

5233.22-25. These negative trends in the lower stratosphere do not appear at all stations and this should be mentioned.

5234.8-13. Again, these statements about ozone recovery are incorrect, should be removed, and are belied by the very next statements in the manuscript. The authors should investigate what the effective equivalent stratospheric chlorine (EESC) is right now. Paul Newman will send you his estimates of that. With this information the authors will see that the EESC is now equivalent to mid 1990 values, or about 4 ppbv. Ample to keep ozone depletion going for many years to come.

5234.20-25. It is sad that these statements have to be taken on credit. None of this information was presented in graphical form. Yet this type of result should be the primary motivation for, and result of, all the work that was done. And as the authors correctly point out this is one of the major conclusions.

Minor issues:

Abstract: Does the reader know what ECC, SD, mean?

5217.7-9. Switch “they” and “ozone soundings” so the reader doesn’t have to guess what “they” are when it appears first.

5220.10-13. This punctuation is wrong. There is no need of a colon. Make it two sentences.

5224.12. ...subsequently by Environment Canada? Who/what is Environment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Canada? Has this been introduced?

5224.17. Where does 1% at 10 hPa come from, this is a shift of 300 m, not 70 m.

5232.13 ... sites appears may be ...?

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 5215, 2015.

**AMTD**

8, C2024–C2033, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C2033

