

Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-239-RC2>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Comment on acp-2022-239

Anonymous Referee #2

---

Referee comment on "Investigation of the limonene photooxidation by OH at different NO concentrations in the atmospheric simulation chamber SAPHIR (Simulation of Atmospheric PHotochemistry In a large Reaction Chamber)" by Jacky Yat Sing Pang et al., Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-239-RC2>, 2022

---

This manuscript presents a series of chamber studies that investigate the OH initiated oxidation of limonene at various NO<sub>x</sub> mixing ratios and also presents an additional experiment that investigates the ozonolysis of limonene in a dark chamber with near-zero NO<sub>x</sub> mixing ratios. Although only a handful of experiments were performed, the manuscript is built around an extensive dataset including measurements of limonene, formaldehyde, HONO, NO<sub>x</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, and photolysis frequencies in addition to the important and technically challenging measurements of OH, HO<sub>2</sub>, RO<sub>2</sub>, and OH reactivity. The measured radical concentrations are compared to results from a box model featuring MCM v3.3.1 chemistry which typically suggests RO<sub>2</sub> concentrations that are much higher, and HO<sub>2</sub> concentrations that are lower than measured values. As suggested by reviewer 1, the discrepancies between measured and modeled RO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, particularly during the low-NO<sub>x</sub> and zero-NO<sub>x</sub> experiments, are significant results that highlight a gap in our understanding of this type of oxidation chemistry. The paper also examines the formaldehyde and organic nitrate yield to further aid in understanding the fate of limonene RO<sub>2</sub> species.

Overall, the paper is well written and is particularly effective at merging the results and discussion of several different experiments, which were performed across a number of years, into a cohesive manuscript with a unified conclusion.

### Specific comments:

Line 138: Is there an estimate for the "small" fraction of limonene-RO<sub>2</sub> that is converted and measured as HO<sub>2</sub> in the LIF detection cell during these experiments? Has this fraction been determined specifically for limonene-RO<sub>2</sub> and the NO concentrations used in detection cell or is it possible that this RO<sub>2</sub> interference is more significant than anticipated? If so, could this at least partially explain the discrepancies between measured and modeled HO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, especially during the ozonolysis experiment when measured RO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were highest?

Line 143: Are the RO<sub>2</sub> concentrations reported from all experiments derived from calibrations with methylperoxy radicals? If so, does this imply that the reported RO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, which are largely due to limonene-RO<sub>2</sub>, represent a lower limit? Or have adjustments been made that take the RO<sub>x</sub>-LIF system's reduced sensitivity to limonene-RO<sub>2</sub> into consideration?

line 207: Are the fluctuations in NO mixing ratios (and ultimately measured and modeled radical concentrations) during the low and medium NO experiments (Figures 3 and 4) caused by changes in HONO production from the chamber source that are driven by changes in solar radiation? If so, these fluctuations may be easier for readers to interpret if measured or parameterized HONO mixing ratios or measurements of photolysis frequencies were shown.

Figure S3: This figure is not discussed in the context of the low NO experiments. This is understandable since only a small portion of this experiment involves limonene oxidation, but since the figure is shown – are the observed RO<sub>2</sub> concentrations prior to the CH<sub>4</sub> addition likely due to the oxidation of some VOC produced in the chamber? It is interesting that, after the CH<sub>4</sub> injection, the measured RO<sub>2</sub> concentration increases as expected (at least relative to the established background), but the measurement/model agreement quickly reverses after limonene addition. Could this difference in measurement/model response to the different VOCs be related to the previously mentioned RO<sub>x</sub>LIF sensitivities to CH<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and limonene-RO<sub>2</sub>? Similarly, the model agrees with the HO<sub>2</sub> measurements during the CH<sub>4</sub> injection but underpredicts the measurements after the limonene injection. While these trends could again indicate a limonene-RO<sub>2</sub> interference in the HO<sub>2</sub> measurement, they could also support the later claims of missing RO<sub>2</sub> loss processes, whether isomerization or RO<sub>2</sub> + RO<sub>2</sub> recombination reactions, that are much faster for large complex monoterpene peroxy radicals (and produce HO<sub>2</sub>), but do not occur for smaller RO<sub>2</sub> species like CH<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. A short discussion on this particular experiment could be useful but is not absolutely necessary.

Line 533: "concentration" can be removed, or this sentence should be otherwise rephrased.

Line 619: This sentence is a bit awkward. Perhaps "In the ozonolysis experiment, prior to the addition of CO as an OH scavenger (Fig. 8d) OH is only produced by the ozonolysis of limonene."

Line 659: Delete "-" after OH

Figures 9, 12, and others in supplement: When data from multiple experiments are presented in one figure it would be useful to also label each panel (or group of panels) with "low NO" or "ozonolysis" instead of just the date. Figures 8 and S6 are good

examples.

Figures 9 and S8: The caption in Figure 9 suggests that  $\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2$  is mainly produced from the oxidation of HCHO while the caption in Figure S8 suggests that  $\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2$  is mainly produced from the oxidation of limonene.

Lines 716, 720, 731, 1003: Some commas are unnecessary.

Line 764/765: This sentence is a bit awkward. Consider "These reactions could involve an unknown reaction partner X, as used in Hofzumahaus et al. (2009), or could be unimolecular reactions." Also, this reference may be missing from the reference list.

Line 893: One example instead of one examples.

Line 1018: Second "in the model" is unnecessary.