

Interactive comment on “Implementation of an IBBCEAS technique in an atmospheric simulation chamber for *in situ* NO₃ monitoring: characterization and validation for kinetic studies” by Axel Fouqueau et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 21 May 2020

Fouqueau et al., AMTD: Implementation of an IBBCEAS technique in an atmospheric simulation chamber for *in situ* NO₃ monitoring: characterization and validation for kinetic studies

Fouqueau et al. present the development and characterisation of an IBBCEAS system and its application to NO₃ kinetic studies of VOCs in an atmospheric simulation chamber. NO₃ was one of the earliest atmospheric targets of optical cavities using ringdown and broadband approaches in the visible region of the spectrum. This work is not new in that respect, nor in the application of such instruments to atmospheric simulation

C1

chambers. Nevertheless, their work goes further than others in applying this method to the determination of absolute rate coefficients in chamber-kinetic studies of VOC oxidation by NO₃. The reported rate coefficient agrees well with other absolute rate coefficients reported in the literature.

While the work is probably eventually publishable, there are omissions and questions about calculations that first need to be addressed. There are also quite a large number of grammatical errors or typos that should be corrected.

1. There are multiple missing references to figures and tables:

L.104, L.150, L.171, L.196, L.213, L.227, L.247, L.295, L.336, L.349, L.356

2. Further technical details should be supplied about

L.116: LED optical power

L.146: specific RH range of the experiments

L.280-90: To form NO₃, either O₃ is needed with NO₂ to form NO₃, or N₂O₅ must be added as a precursor. This information is missing in the description. The authors should supply these experimental details along with relevant chemical equations.

L.270: The NO₃ concentration should be stated explicitly. Presumably the concentration was zero? How would other absorbing species like NO₂ influence the fit variability?

3. It is not clear how the authors calculated certain values. These figures need to be checked:

L.177: I calculate 3.15 km for $R = 0.99974$ and $d = 0.82$ m, whereas the authors report 3.4 km. Also, it should also be clarified that this is the pathlength across the full optical cavity length (82 cm) and includes the purge volumes. When purging, the effective pathlength would be about 25% shorter.

L.182: I calculate 12% variation, not 20%

C2

4. The authors should comment briefly on photolysis of NO₃ by the IBBCEAS probe beam, potential surface losses of reactants, and the influence of water vapour and aerosols on the spectral analysis. These issues are likely unimportant for kinetic experiments, but should be noted for completeness.
5. It is not entirely clear how the effect of I0 stability has been determined. Is the 3% change in NO₂ concentration seen at all concentrations, or is it a typical or worst case scenario? Can losses to walls influence the analysis? The residual in Fig. 3 looks very much like the NO₂ absorption spectrum, so why does fitting with the NO₂ cross-section not eliminate these features better?
6. For the detection limit calculation, the authors should specify whether this calculation is for a purged or unpurged system.
7. The calculation of the detection limit is based on the signal-to-noise ratio for a single wavelength. However, the spectral fit is constrained by many independent signal measurements at different wavelengths. The authors should evaluate how the multiplex nature of the measurement affects the system's detection limit.
8. Figure 6: At low pptv, it looks like there's still an IBBCEAS signal for NO₃ but no FTIR signal. Does this divergence reflect a difference in instrument sensitivities, or equilibrium/heterogeneous chemistry, or some other cause? Please comment.
9. L.313: Are spatial inhomogeneities in gas concentrations expected in the chamber?
10. Figure 7. NO₃ and butene losses are very rapid. Would data quality be increased by selecting reaction conditions to produce a slower reaction and more data points?
11. Most of the uncertainty in the kinetics data arises from the uncertainty in the FTIR results. Calibrated CIMS or PTR-MS might be better suited for co-measurement of VOCs. The authors may want to discuss these considerations for their kinetic studies.

Minor corrections:

C3

- L.27: either "the NO₃ radical has..." or "NO₃ has..."
- L.38: "one of the reasons for this..."
- L.46: "progress has been made"
- L.53: "For this purpose,"
- L.63: "presented in detail"
- L.76: "NO₃ was"
- L.101: "planar/concave"
- L.106: "prevent adsorption of..."
- L.115: Caption Caption should note that collimating lenses and curved mirrors are not shown on the beam injection side.
- L.127: "LED current is fixed at 900 mA"
- L.132: "to focus the beam"
- L.143: hyphen in reference
- L.175: "justifies...wide scale". It is unclear what is meant by this. That it should be measured over a wide wavelength range, or that it is not necessary to do so?
- L.182: "prior to each experiment"
- L.196: "up to 3 % in NO₂ concentration"
- Figure 3. Change "residue" to "residual" in figure titles and legends.
- L.280: "was first filled with dry synthetic air"
- L.281: "Air Liquide NO₂,"
- L.287: NO₂ and N₂O₅ concentrations

C4

L.300: in IBI and in the spectral treatment

L389: performance

L.396: Clarify “from ppt to ppt range for NO₃”

L.400: Monitoring NO₃ radicals

L.409: intercomparison

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2020-103, 2020.