Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/amt-2016-112-RC1, 2016

Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions
Open Access

Interactive comment on "Assessment of ^{222}Radon progeny loss in long tubing based on static filter measurements in the laboratory and in the field" *by* Ingeborg Levin et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 6 July 2016

General comments

A very interesting and useful contribution on the consequences of using long sampling lines in single-filter atmospheric radon measurements. A simple method is developed, and verified both in the laboratory and field, for correcting single-filter radon measurements for the effects of losses due to deposition of aerosol-attached radon progeny onto the walls of inlet tubes of varying lengths up to 200m. The results are discussed with reference to a number of possible aerosol deposition mechanisms inside tubing, with the outcome that the technique is both supported theoretically and has its limitations specifically identified and quantified. The prospect that inlet tubing deposition effects can be accurately corrected will reduce an important source of uncertainty in single-filter radon measurements, and expand the list of potential applications for these (relatively compact) detectors to include tall tower sites. This manuscript falls within the scope of AMT and describes topical original research worthy of publication. Furthermore, the manuscript is for the most part clearly written and well structured. I therefore recommend acceptance, after attention has been paid to a few minor issues and technical corrections listed below.

Minor changes / technical corrections

Abstract

P1, L11: Change "tubing (laboratory test) and" to "tubing in the laboratory, and".

P1, L12: "Progeny loss increased exponentially with length of the tubing". I think this is over-stating it a bit, as the increase could equally well be described as "linear". Perhaps just say "Progeny loss increased steeply with length of the tubing".

P1, L13: After "for 8.2 mm ID rolled-up tubing of 200 m length", I think you should add "at a flow rate of 1 mˆ3 hourˆ-1" or similar. I think it is important to specify the flow rate, as the deposition efficiency is strongly dependant on it (see Eq. 3).

P1, L19: Change "above 1" to "between 1-2".

1 Introduction

P1, L22: Change "used as tracer" to "used as a tracer".

P1, L25-26: Change "shortly after the generation of the progeny" to "shortly after generation in the atmosphere".

P1, L26-27: Rewrite sentence as "In so-called two-filter systems, filtered air that only contains 222Rn (with ambient progeny removed) is flushed through a large delay chamber and the new 222Rn progeny produced in situ inside the tank are then collected on a second internal filter. . .".

P1, L30: "In this style of detector, atmospheric 222Rn activity concentration is then. . .".

P2, L8: Change "implemented e.g. at tower stations, where" to "implemented at locations (e.g. tower stations) where".

P2, L22: Change "Zahorowski, 1998). Alternatively, the Heidelberg" to "Zahorowski, 1998), whereas the Heidelberg".

P2, L23-24: Delete ", and routine maintenance work and data evaluation are less demanding than for the two-filter systems (Whittlestone and Zahorowski, 1998)". This is not generally true with modern versions of the two-filter detectors, which are very robust and include automated calibration and background checking systems that allow them to operate for months or even years at a time without human intervention.

P2, L32: Change "Whittelstone" to "Whittlestone".

2 Methods

P3, L7: Change "used as tracer" to "used as a tracer".

P3, L19: Change "estimating the atmospheric" to "estimation of the atmospheric".

P3, L31: Change "ratios of two" to "ratios for the two".

P4, L3: It would be nice to know if there are any ambient temperature or humidity effects on deposition rates, but I guess this was out of the scope of your study. However, I would have thought that it would be fairly easy to test the effects of different flow rates, especially given the expected strong dependency on Q (see Eq. 3). Did you investigate flow rate sensitivity?

P4, L20: Change "For these measurements" to "For these latter measurements".

P4, L22: Change "They allow to determine possible" to "They allow the determination of possible".

P4, L24: How is the flow rate maintained in the 200m tube on the tower? Was it the same as in the laboratory tests? Given the expected strong dependency of deposition efficiency on Q (Eq. 3), it would have been good to know the variability of flow rate achieved through the 200m tube on the tower.

3 Results

P5, L9-11: Need to rearrange / change the first two sentences after Eq. (1) in order to explain some of the terms better. I suggest something like: "where parameters A and C0 are constants, and R(L) is the "saturation" activity ratio for line length L. The activity ratios for the 200 m line test have been fitted accordingly in Fig. 1b, with the fit curve plotted as a solid red line with R(L)=0.66".

P5, L12: Change "They yielded" to "This process yielded".

P5, L13: "An exponentially decreasing…". Looking at the plot, this could equally well be described by a linear fit. Maybe you should explain your choice of an exponential fitting function (e.g. we would expect R(L)$\rightarrow$ 0 as L$\rightarrow\infty$).

P5, L19: Define L0 (e.g. "where L0 is a constant parameter").

P5, L20: Change "then principally" to "therefore in principle".

P5, L23-25: Please elaborate briefly how you corrected and "normalised"? I guess you added [1-R(L)] to both sides of Eq. (1), which is equivalent to modifying CLTM on the LHS by adding CHD-R[1-R(L)]?

P5, L28: Change "as shown in Fig. 2b" to "as shown in Fig. 2a".

P6, L24: At what flow rate? What was the variability of the flow rate?

4 Discussion

P9, L9: Change "were quite more turbulent and sharper bended" to "were quite a lot more turbulent and more sharply bended".

5 Conclusions

P10, L25: Change “pile-up” to “accumulation”.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2016-112, 2016.