Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2018-373-AC2, 2019 © Author(s) 2019. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.





Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Application of Open Path Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (OP-FTIR) to Measure Greenhouse Gas Concentrations from Agricultural Soils" by C.-H. Lin et al.

C.-H. Lin et al.

lin471@purdue.edu

Received and published: 15 January 2019

Thank you for your comments and suggestions. Our responses to the "Several issues should be addressed" were as follows:

1. In section 2.3, the authors stated that "we selected ninety spectra containing 338 ± 0.5 ppbv N2O and ninety-three spectra containing 400 ± 5 ppmv CO2 which were measured from the S-OPS. These group of spectra covered broad ranges of water vapour content and air temperature. N2O and CO2 concentrations were calculated

Printer-friendly version



from these selected spectra using different quantitative methods." What is the exact meaning of "ninety spectra containing 338 ± 0.5 ppbv N2O"? The purpose of the selection seems to be "avoid non-linear response of absorbance to the wide range of gas concentrations", then how could " 338 ± 0.5 ppbv N2O"serve this purpose?

Response: 1) The atmospheric N2O concentrations were simultaneously measured from the S-OPS and OP-FTIR along the same path. The S-OPS-measured N2O was used as a benchmark to examine the performance of the OP-FTIR quantitative methods. Thus, each spectrum was corresponding to a particular N2O concentration measured from the S-OPS. These quantitative methods were tested using the selected ninety OP-FTIR spectra where the S-OPS-measured N2O concentrations ranged from 337.4 – 338.5 ppbv. Likewise, ninety-three spectra where the CO2 concentrations ranged from 405.4 – 394.9 ppmv were selected. The statistics of N2O and CO2 concentrations were shown in the following table 1. 2) A broad range of the path-integrated concentration tends to result in a non-linear response of absorbance to concentration. The selected spectra contained particular N2O/CO2 concentrations but various water vapor contents and temperature. The non-linear response of absorbance to the changed water vapor content cannot be solved, but the effect of the changed N2O/CO2 on the non-linearity of absorbance can be minimized by constraining gas concentrations.

2. In section 2.4, the authors stated that "Each sampled spectrum was acquired by coadding 64 single-sided interferograms (IFGs) at a nominal resolution of 0.5 cm-1, which accounted for 32,000 data points were collected with the interval of 0.241 wavenumbers between data points, ..." For interferograms, the unit of the interval of data points is cm, not wavenumber.

Response: This sentence might be confused. It means that a resolution of 0.5 cm-1 accounting for a data point every 0.241 wavenumbers was used for acquiring SB spectra (400 – 4000 cm-1), and approximate 32,000 data points were in the interferogram.

AMTD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version



3. In section 2.4, the authors employed some criteria to remove low-quality IFGs, which includes those of very intense centerburst. It is true that intense-centerburst IFGs result in severe non-linear response of MCT detectors. However, such IFGs have high signal-to-noise ratio, and would be valid once the non-linear detector response is corrected. The authors might be interested in correcting method (L. Shao, P.R. Griffiths, Anal. Chem., 2008, 80(13), 5219).

Response: The maximum A/DC capacity in this study was approximately 2.49 Volts. The optical path length of the OP-FTIR was 300 meters. The maximum or minimum value of the IFG centerburst in this study located between 0.61-1.14 volts, which prevented the MCT detector from saturation as well as avoided the non-linear response of the detector.

4. In section 2.5.1, the authors stated using "a high-order fitting function" as the synthetic background. It is better to be specific about the function, is it a quadratic, cubic polynomial, or something else?

Response: Numerous data points were selected from the field SB spectrum. A polynomial function was used to fit the field spectrum to synthesize the SB background without features of gas absorption.

5. In section 2.5.2, some useful information about PLS models is not provided, such as the number of calibration spectra (to build the model), the concentration range that the model covers, the number of factors for the model.

Response: Sixty mixed-gas (i.e., N2O + water vapor) spectra were collected from the lab-based FTIR joined with the multi-pass gas cell (the optical path length of 33 meters). Concentrations of N2O and water vapor ranged from 0.3 - 0.7 ppmv and 7000 – 30,000 ppmv, respectively. More details of the calibration spectra were shown in the following Table 2.

6. In section 2.6, it is better to be specific about the statistical tests, are they t-test or

AMTD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version



paired t-test?

Response: For N2O analysis, twelve quantitative models that were used to calculate N2O concentration from ninety OP-FTIR spectra were examined to optimize the combinations of SB backgrounds (i.e., zap- and syn-bkg), multivariate models (i.e., CLS and PLS), and analytical windows (i.e., WN1-WN4). In order to compare the means of the twelve populations, the Fisher's Least significant difference (LSD) was used for multiple comparisons ($\alpha = 0.05$). Likewise, the LSD was also used to compare six population means for the CO2 analysis.

7. In section 3.2, the authors present the result of CLS (zap-bkg) and CLS (syn-bkg), and the result of PLS (syn-bkg). Why is the result of PLS (zap-bkg) absent? It seems that the authors did not apply PLS to estimate the concentrations of CO2, as they did in case of N2O. The reason should be explained.

Response: 1) The syn-bkg is one of the recommended methods for converting the SB to absorbance spectra, but the zap-bkg was the new proposed method. Thus, the syn-bkg was used to examine the feasibility as well as the performance of the zap-bkg. The identical field SB spectra, analytical windows, and CLS model were used to calculate gas concentrations from the zap- and syn-bkg converted absorbance spectra. For both N2O and CO2 analyses, the zap-bkg method led to higher biases in concentration calculations than the syn-bkg using CLS models. In section 3.2, the zap-bkg resulted in great underestimations (i.e., Bias > 9%) for N2O quantification and the syn-bkg improved the quantitative accuracy. Applying the PLS to quantify gas concentration from the zap-bkg converted spectra unlikely improve the quantitative accuracy. For simplification, we did not report the results of the integrated uses of the zap-bkg and PLS model. 2) Compared with N2O analysis, the integration of the synbkg and CLS model provided decent predictions for CO2 concentrations, which was presumably due to the simplicity of the CO2 absorption feature at 2170-2085 cm-1. This combination, however, did not provide the same accuracy for N2O predictions. Therefore, we only applied the PLS model for N2O predictions, and this model did

AMTD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version



improve its accuracy.

8. Fig.7(b) is strange. As stated in the Fig.7(b), bias = FTIR – S-OPS. According to this formula, the bias between 11/6/2014 and 12/6/2014 is negative, since the FTIR concentrations are clearly lower than S-OPS. But in the figure the corresponding bias is positive.

Response: The Y-axis of bias (%) is reverse, so the biases should be negative. Also, the updated Fig.7 and the explanation for updating Fig7(b) were described in the author comment (AC1).

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2018-373, 2018.

AMTD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version



AMTD

Interactive comment

Casas	Statistics of the S-OPS measured concentrations							
Gases	Mean	SD	Max	Median	Min	n		
N ₂ O (ppbv)	337.9	0.3	338.5	337.9	337.4	90		
CO_2 (ppmv)	399.8	3.0	405.4	398.9	394.9	93		

Fig. 1. Table 1. The S-OPS measured concentrations of N2O/CO2 used for OP-FTIR quantitative method evaluations.

Printer-friendly version



AMTD

Interactive

(a) N₂O/water vapor concentrations

Sportratt	N ₂ O	N ₂ O	Water vapor	Water vapor	Sportratt	N ₂ O	N ₂ O	Water vapor	Water vapor
Spectra#	(ppm)	(ppm*m)	(ppm)	(ppm*m)	spectra#	(ppm)	(ppm*m)	(ppm)	(ppm*m)
1	0.31	10.23	7330.60	241909.89	31	0.31	10.23	20720.00	683760.00
2	0.31	10.23	7334.38	242034.64	32	0.31	10.23	20720.00	683760.00
3	0.31	10.23	7344.42	242365.75	33	0.31	10.23	20720.00	683760.00
4	0.40	13.20	7345.97	242417.03	34	0.40	13.20	21166.00	698478.00
5	0.40	13.20	7335.69	242077.81	35	0.40	13.20	21166.00	698478.00
6	0.40	13.20	7384.26	243680.45	36	0.40	13.20	21166.00	698478.00
7	0.50	16.50	7425.25	245033.38	37	0.50	16.50	21352.00	704616.00
8	0.50	16.50	7435.31	245365.38	38	0.50	16.50	21352.00	704616.00
9	0.50	16.50	7428.77	245149.42	39	0.50	16.50	21352.00	704616.00
10	0.60	19.80	7472.43	246590.20	40	0.60	19.80	22409.00	739497.00
11	0.60	19.80	7561.33	249524.05	41	0.60	19.80	22409.00	739497.00
12	0.60	19.80	7561.16	249518.13	42	0.60	19.80	22409.00	739497.00
13	0.70	23.10	7428.18	245129.78	43	0.70	23.10	25814.00	851862.00
14	0.70	23.10	7387.42	243784.78	44	0.70	23.10	25814.00	851862.00
15	0.70	23.10	7359.32	242857.45	45	0.70	23.10	25814.00	851862.00
16	0.31	10.23	15367.62	507131.41	46	0.31	10.23	26786.16	883943.19
17	0.31	10.23	15372.82	507303.06	47	0.31	10.23	26584.12	877275.94
18	0.31	10.23	15360.80	506906.44	48	0.31	10.23	26597.24	877708.81
19	0.40	13.20	15595.24	514643.03	49	0.40	13.20	30446.93	1004748.69
20	0.40	13.20	15704.48	518247.72	50	0.40	13.20	30738.75	1014378.88
21	0.40	13.20	15708.70	518387.22	51	0.40	13.20	30386.46	1002753.19
22	0.50	16.50	15521.94	512224.06	52	0.50	16.50	29310.16	967235.44
23	0.50	16.50	15678.90	517403.75	53	0.50	16.50	28955.07	955517.25
24	0.50	16.50	15771.27	520452.06	54	0.50	16.50	28851.81	952109.88
25	0.60	19.80	15766.92	520308.47	55	0.60	19.80	28499.03	940467.94
26	0.60	19.80	15707.03	518332.09	56	0.60	19.80	28247.49	932167.31
27	0.60	19.80	15859.43	523361.28	57	0.60	19.80	27876.50	919924.50
28	0.70	23.10	16033.97	529121.00	58	0.70	23.10	28584.89	943301.38
29	0.70	23.10	15967.60	526930.88	59	0.70	23.10	29724.95	980923.31
30	0.70	23.10	15887.32	524281.53	60	0.70	23.10	29897.34	986612.19

(b) The number of factors in PLS models

	No. of factors in PLS			
Analytical window (cm ⁻¹)	N_2O	water vapor		
W _N 1: 2170.0 - 2223.7	3	5		
W _N 2: 2188.5 - 2223.7	4	4		
W _N 3: 2188.5 - 2204.1 + 2215.8 - 2223.7	4	4		
W _N 4: 2188.5 - 2204.1	5	4		

Fig. 2. Table 2. Sixty mixed-gases calibration spectra were used to build PLS models for N2O quantification: (a) concentrations of N2O and water vapor, and (b) the number of factors used in PLS models.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



comment