

Interactive comment on “Aircraft measurements of bromine monoxide, iodine monoxide, and glyoxal profiles in the tropics: comparison with ship-based and in situ measurements” by R. Volkamer et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 March 2015

This is an interesting paper that describes air-borne MAX-DOAS measurements of BrO, IO, glyoxal, NO₂, H₂O, and aerosol vertical profiles performed over the tropical Eastern Pacific Ocean as part of the TORERO project, and their validation using correlative ship-based and in-situ observations. Such data sets are particularly relevant for testing our understanding of the chemical processes involving halogens and organic carbon species in the tropical troposphere – which is a timely subject matter –, as well as for validating satellite observations. The authors show that a good agreement is generally found between the air-borne vertical profiles of the above species and the

C248

correlative ship-based and in-situ measurements, indicating the strong reliability and robustness of their retrievals. The paper being well written, this is in my opinion a valuable contribution worth publishing in AMT after addressing the following specific comments:

Title of the paper: Since a significant part of the study is also devoted to aerosols, NO₂, and H₂O, these species should also appear in the title.

Abstract: The time period of the TORERO campaign (January/February 2012) is missing and should be mentioned.

Introduction, page 628, lines 10-12: There was a total of 17 TORERO flights but only two case studies are presented here. On which criteria did you select them? Is there a plan to apply the presented retrieval method to the 15 other flights?

Sect. 2.7 on the profile retrieval from air-borne and ship-based MAX-DOAS data (pages 634-636): To my opinion, there is a clear lack of information about the OEM settings for both AMAX and SMAX retrievals, e.g. which a priori profiles are used for aerosol but also trace gas species, how a priori covariance matrices are constructed? Is the linear or non-linear OEM used? For the error budget of the OEM inversion, it is made reference to Baidar et al. (2013) but how valid is it since Baidar et al. (2013) describes air-borne MAX-DOAS retrievals over terrestrial environment (California) while the present study deals with measurements over ocean? I encourage the authors to thoroughly revise this section.

Also related to the error budget, what are the error bars associated to the glyoxal and IO profiles presented in Figs. 8 and 9? Are they corresponding to the errors coming from the OEM inversion? Is the impact of the SCDref also included in them? This should be at least mentioned in the legend of these figures but preferably also discussed in Sect. 2.7 (see my comment above) or in a new ad hoc section.

Page 635, lines 10-14: I think it would be more comfortable for the reader to gather the

C249

SCDref values in a table.

Page 636, lines 23-28: Is the RAQMS model well suited for atmospheric marine chemistry ? For instance, does it contain the most important reactions of halogens on marine aerosols ? Which data are assimilated in the model ? This should be briefly discussed.

Technical corrections:

Page 627, line 20: 'atmospheric' -> 'atmospheric'

References:

Baidar, S., Oetjen, H., Coburn, S., Dix, B., Ortega, I., Sinreich, R., and Volkamer, R.: The CU Airborne MAX-DOAS instrument: vertical profiling of aerosol extinction and trace gases, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 719–739, doi:10.5194/amt-6-719-2013, 2013.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, 8, 623, 2015.