

Comment on acp-2022-800

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Impact of HO₂ aerosol uptake on radical levels and O₃ production during summertime in Beijing" by Joanna E. Dyson et al., Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2022-800-RC2>, 2023

This paper presents an analysis of the impact of heterogeneous HO₂ radical uptake on aerosols on the concentration of HO₂ and its impact on the sensitivity of ozone production in Beijing during the AIRPRO campaign. Recent studies have suggested that efforts to reduce high concentrations of particulate matter may result in increased ozone production due to the increased concentration of HO₂ radicals resulting from a reduction in the heterogeneous loss of HO₂ radicals on aerosols. The authors incorporate heterogeneous loss of HO₂ into their model to determine its impact on the modeled radical concentrations. They find that the loss of HO₂ has a negligible effect on the modeled concentrations, suggesting that HO₂ uptake on aerosols is not important under most of the conditions encountered during AIRPRO. Heterogeneous loss of HO₂ can be important under the lower NO conditions often observed in the afternoon and that under cleaner conditions, a decrease in aerosol surface area could lead to increased HO₂ concentrations that could impact ozone production. The authors evaluate the impact of heterogeneous loss of HO₂ on the sensitivity of ozone production, finding that NO_x control strategies may not be as efficient at reducing ozone production as expected given the impact of reduced heterogeneous loss of HO₂ with decreasing aerosol concentrations.

The paper is well written and provides some new information regarding the importance of heterogeneous HO₂ uptake on ozone production. While a previous paper by this group (Whalley et al., 2021) touches on the potential impact of HO₂ uptake on ozone production, this paper provides a more detailed analysis. The paper would be acceptable for publication after the authors have addressed the following comments:

- Since the measured and modeled OH, HO₂, and RO₂ concentrations have been discussed in detail in Whalley et al., 2021, the authors should focus this paper on the impact of HO₂ uptake on the modeled concentrations. In that light, I would recommend removing Section 2.2 and referencing the Whalley et al., 2021 ACP paper (and updating the reference to the discussion paper).
- I would also suggest moving the description of the LN/Q and absolute O₃ sensitivity calculation (lines 570-603) to section 2 after the model description, and instead focusing on the results in Section 3.
- The authors provide a brief description regarding potential reasons for the discrepancy between the modeled radical concentrations with the measurements, which are discussed in detail in Whalley et al. (2021). However, at first read the description here does not appear to be consistent with the description in Whalley et al. For example, line 462 states that the overprediction of HO₂ by the model may be due to "an under-prediction in the rate of reaction of RO₂ with NO to produce a different RO₂ species..."

while the conclusion in Whalley et al. 2021 is that the “propagation rate of RO₂ to HO₂ may be substantially slower than assumed.” While I believe the reasoning is consistent between the two papers, the wording here could be clarified to remove any potential confusion.

- Similar to that described in Sakamoto et al. (2019), the authors include uptake of RO₂ radicals into account when analyzing the impact of aerosol uptake on ozone production sensitivity. Given the authors suggestion that the overprediction of HO₂ and underprediction of RO₂ is due to isomerization of complex RO₂ or RO radicals that effectively increases the lifetime of RO₂ radicals and slows the propagation of RO₂ to HO₂, can the authors comment on whether uptake of RO₂ radicals in this scenario could impact the concentration of RO₂ radicals and the rate of ozone production? What effective lifetime of RO₂ radicals would heterogeneous uptake be competitive and impact RO₂ concentrations? Perhaps include a plot similar to Figure 8 for RO₂ loss to address this?