

## ***Interactive comment on “Nitrogen dioxide stratospheric column at the subtropical NDACC station of Izaña from DOAS, FTIR and satellite instrumentation” by Cristina Robles-Gonzalez et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 10 May 2016

The author’s reply does not address my initial concern regarding the effective SZA correction:

- The proposed ESZA correction is meritorious for species with relatively short photochemical lifetimes, NO<sub>2</sub> in particular. Considering the sensitivity of the issue (e.g., ~30% NO<sub>2</sub> changes between SZA=90 and SZA=86.8 cases around the winter solstice), there is a lack of detail about the ESZA evaluation. Using some overly simplistic assumptions, one may arrive at EZSA~85 instead of the used ESZA=86.8. Unless all the underlying details and assumptions are explicitly mentioned by the authors, it is

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



impossible to judge validity of the approach.

- The same applies to the effective (projected) DOAS pathway used in the DOAS-satellite collocations. Why the authors arrive at the 300 km estimate instead of, e.g., ~360 km (again, using, for a sake of argument, overly simplistic, purely geometric assumptions and ESZA=86.8)? Is there some optical-pathway weighting applied by the authors? [There should be some.] Please provide more details.

Additional remarks:

- Figure 4, bottom-left panel: Why the DOAS-FTIR SZA=90 difference is negative? I see a positive shift in the upper-left panel. Two panels contradict each other. Now, going to Table 2, I also see the negative SZA=90 DOAS-FTIR shift. The negative sign also quoted in the text (Section 7) and re-confirmed in Figure 6. This contradiction must be resolved. What FTIR and DOAS data are used in the plot and the stats (Table 2)? AM? PM? Both?

- Please clarify the AM/PM split in the FTIR data (Fig. 5). Is this related to how the FTIR data are referenced to the either DOAS-AM or DOAS-PM observations? Or you really subdivide the FTIR records into the AM and PM parts? If the latter is true, then Fig. 6 should have two FTIR points. So does Table 3. Please be explicit in description of the data sets in Table 3: e.g., does the OMI-DOAS mean OMI-DOAS(AM), or OMI-DOAS(PM), or something else?

- The caption of Figure 10 mentions two panels, (a) and (b). I see only one.

- Lines 400-405. The more pronounced NO<sub>2</sub> trends seen in the DOAS observations are ascribed to the relatively higher DOAS sensitivity to the lower-stratospheric NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. How does this questionable conclusion come along with the factor-of-three lower changes detected by SCIAMACHY and OMI, despite their comparatively high strat-trop sensitivity (cf. the DOAS and satellite AVKs in Fig.1)? It seems, in this respect the DOAS observations are the only outstanding category, since both FTIR

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



and satellites deliver comparable results, despite their different sensitivity to various stratospheric NO<sub>2</sub> layers.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2016-41, 2016.

**AMTD**

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

