Comparison of modeled and observed values of NO₂ and JNO₂ during the Photochemistry of Ozone Loss in the Arctic Region in Summer (POLARIS) mission
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Abstract. Stratospheric measurements of NO, NO₂, O₃, ClO, and HO₂ were made during spring, early summer, and late summer in the Arctic region during 1997 as part of the Photochemistry of Ozone Loss in the Arctic Region in Summer (POLARIS) field campaign. In the sunlit atmosphere, NO₂ and NO are in steady state through NO₂ photolysis and reactions involving O₃, ClO, BrO, and HO₂. By combining observations of O₃, ClO, and HO₂, observed and modeled values of the NO₂ photolysis rate coefficient (JNO₂), and model estimates of BrO, several comparisons are made between steady state and measured values of both NO₂ and JNO₂. An apparent seasonal dependence in discrepancies between calculated and measured values was found; however, a source for this dependence could not be identified. Overall, the mean linear fits in the various comparisons show agreement within 19%, well within the combined uncertainties (±50 to 70%). These results suggest that photochemistry controlling the NO₂/NO abundance ratio is well represented throughout much of the sunlit lower stratosphere. A reduction in the uncertainty of laboratory determinations of the rate coefficient of NO + O₃ → NO₂ + O₂ would aid future analyses of these or similar atmospheric observations.

1. Introduction

With mixing ratios in the parts per trillion (pptv) to parts per billion (ppbv) range in the lower stratosphere, hydrogen, nitrogen, and halogen radicals (HOₓ = OH + HO₂; NOₓ = NO + NO₂; ClOₓ = Cl + ClO; BrOₓ = Br + BrO) play important roles in the destruction of stratospheric ozone (O₃) through their respective catalytic cycles. Although the net contribution to O₃ loss from the HOₓ, ClOₓ, and BrOₓ catalytic cycles generally exceeds that of NOₓ in the lower stratosphere at midlatitudes [Wennberg et al., 1994], NOₓ plays a significant role in moderating O₃ destruction by controlling the partitioning between the hydroxy radical (OH) and the hydroperoxy radical (HO₂) and between chlorine monoxide (ClO) and chlorine nitrate (ClONO₂) in most regions of the atmosphere.

In the Photochemistry of Ozone Loss in the Arctic Region in Summer (POLARIS) mission, observations of NOₓ, NOᵧ (= NO + NO₂ + NO₃ + N₂O₅ + ClONO₂ + HNO₃ + HONO + HO₂NO₂ + BrONO₂ . . .), and a variety of other reactive and long-lived species were obtained in the summer polar stratosphere. The observations considered here were made with instruments on board the NASA ER-2 high-altitude aircraft. POLARIS took place between April and September of 1997, with the majority of ER-2 flights originating from Fort Wainwright in Fairbanks, Alaska (65°N, 147°W). During summer in the Arctic lower stratosphere, mixing ratios of NOₓ (shaded area of Figure 1) are enhanced relative to total NOᵧ and other radical species. During periods of continuous solar illumination, the rapid photolysis of nitrogen trioxide (NO₃, nitrate radical) prevents formation of dinitrogen pentoxide (N₂O₅), thereby shutting down one of the major pathways for converting NOₓ to nitric acid (HNO₃). Long hours of sunlight also increase the role of other photolytic pathways within the NOᵧ reservoir, converting higher oxides of nitrogen to nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), as indicated by the dashed arrows in Figure 1. These changes in photochemical conditions increase the local contribution of NOₓ to O₃ loss rates
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Figure 1. Diagram denoting the principal species of the NOy reservoir and reaction pathways relevant to the lower stratosphere. Larger boxes and thicker arrows indicate a greater abundance and larger reaction rate, respectively, but are not necessarily to scale. Photolysis is designated by dashed arrows and the label hv.

[Randeniya et al., 1997; Bruhl et al., 1998]. Studies of NOy/NO ratios for POLARIS have shown that models using reaction rate coefficients from DeMore et al. [1997] significantly underestimate this ratio [Gao et al., 1999; Druil et al., this issue; Osterman et al., 1999]. Though a variety of models (semi-empirical, diurnal photochemical steady state, and trajectory models) have been used in these analyses, all include the same reactions that define the steady state relationship between nitric oxide (NO) and NO₂, as shown in the shaded region in Figure 1.

NO and NO₂ interconvert through the following reactions:

(R1) \( \text{NO}_2 + \text{hv} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{O} \)

(R2) \( \text{NO} + \text{O}_3 \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{O}_2 \)

(R3) \( \text{NO} + \text{ClO} \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{Cl} \)

(R4) \( \text{NO} + \text{BrO} \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{Br} \)

(R5) \( \text{NO} + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{OH} \)

Owing to the short lifetime (-60-200 s) of NO₂ through reaction (R1) at 20 km [DeMore et al., 1997], a nearly instantaneous photochemical steady state exists between NO and NO₂ for most daytime conditions in the lower stratosphere. Other reactions, such as those that interconvert NO₂ and HNO₃, BrONO₂, ClONO₂, and N₂O₅ (Figure 1), are orders of magnitude slower and do not participate in defining the steady state partitioning of NO and NO₂. This steady state can be used to estimate values of NO₂ from measurements of other species through the following expression:

\[
[\text{NO}_2]_{ss} = \frac{k_2[\text{O}_3]+k_3[\text{ClO}]+k_4[\text{BrO}]+k_5[\text{HO}_2][\text{NO}]}{J_{\text{NO}_2}} \tag{1a}
\]

where \( k_n \) represents the reaction rate coefficient for reaction \( (Rn) \), \( J_{\text{NO}_2} \) represents the photolysis rate coefficient for reaction \( (R1) \), and \( [X] \) represents the number density of species \( X \). Because of the limited contribution of the ClO, BrO, and HO₂ terms in (1a), this expression is sometimes approximated as follows:

\[
[\text{NO}_2]_{ss} = \frac{k_2[\text{O}_3]+k_3[\text{ClO}]}{J_{\text{NO}_2}} \tag{1b}
\]

\[
[\text{NO}_2]_{ss} = \frac{k_2[\text{O}_3]+k_4[\text{BrO}]}{J_{\text{NO}_2}} \tag{1c}
\]

or

\[
[\text{NO}_2]_{ss} = \frac{k_2[\text{O}_3][\text{NO}]}{J_{\text{NO}_2}} \tag{1d}
\]

Some past evaluations of \( [\text{NO}_2]_{ss} \) have used simultaneous in situ measurements of NO, NO₂, O₃, and ClO (equation (1c)) and calculated values of BrO (equation (1b)), covering regions from midlatitudes to Antarctic high latitudes. These studies have demonstrated that values of \( [\text{NO}_2]_{ss} \) are larger than measured values of NO₂ by between 8% [Gao et al., 1999] and 40% [Jaege et al., 1994]. In contrast, observations of NO₂ made from the balloon-borne Jet Propulsion Laboratory MkIV Interferometer were larger than NO₂ values calculated with a photochemical model by up to 30% for altitudes less than 30 km [Sen et al., 1998].

The steady state expression in equation (1a) can be rearranged to solve for \( J_{\text{NO}_2} \) as

\[
J_{\text{NO}_2,ss} = \frac{k_2[\text{O}_3]+k_3[\text{ClO}]+k_4[\text{BrO}]+k_5[\text{HO}_2][\text{NO}]}{[\text{NO}_2]} \tag{2}
\]

where \( J_{\text{NO}_2,ss} \) is defined as the value of \( J_{\text{NO}_2} \) calculated from (2) using measured values of NO₂ and other species. Equations (1a) and (2) are mathematically related. Using equation (2), \( J_{\text{NO}_2,ss} \) values are compared directly with values of \( J_{\text{NO}_2} \) derived from radiation field models and from spectroradiometer observations.

In this study, comparisons will be made between measured values of NO₂ and values of \( [\text{NO}_2]_{ss} \) calculated with equations (1a) – (1d). The contributions of the BrO, HO₂, and ClO terms to steady state production of NO₂ will be evaluated for each of the three POLARIS deployments. In addition, values of \( J_{\text{NO}_2,ss} \) calculated according to equation (2) will be compared with values of \( J_{\text{NO}_2} \) derived from spectroradiometer observations on the ER-2 and from radiation field models.

2. Measurements and Derived Quantities

Typical ER-2 flights during POLARIS ranged from 6-8 hours in length, during which the ER-2 cruised at an altitude of ~18-20 km (~65 mbar) in the lower stratosphere. The observations used in the current analysis were selected from the POLARIS data set for pressures between 50 and 100 mbar to remove measurement uncertainties associated with aircraft ascents and descents. A list of the POLARIS flights used here and the range of conditions encountered by the ER-2 is
given in Table 1. ER-2 instrument characteristics are given in Table 2.

2.1. NO and NO₂

Measurements of NO and NO₂ were provided by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Aeronomy Laboratory chemiluminescence detector. NO is detected using the chemiluminescent reaction with O₃. In a photolysis cell located upstream of the chemiluminescence reaction vessel, 30 to 50% of ambient NO₂ is converted into NO. A schematic of the photolysis system is shown in Figure 2, and operating characteristics and uncertainty terms are listed in Table 3. A combination of color-glass optical filters reduces the UV bandwidth from the broad band light that reaches the ambient sample and selectively photolyzes NO₂ [Gao et al., 1997]. Fans provide cooling air from a duct along the aircraft skin to minimize heating of the ambient sample, the photolysis cell, and the filters.

When the shutter between the photolysis lamp and cell is open, the NO signal measured in the NO₂ channel is the sum of ambient NO (NOamb) plus the fraction of ambient NO₂ (NO₂amb) converted to NO in the photolysis cell, or

\[
\text{NO}_{\text{meas}} = \text{NO}_{\text{amb}} + \alpha \text{NO}_2^{\text{amb}} \tag{3}
\]

where \(\alpha\) represents the conversion fraction. The value of \(\text{NO}_2^{\text{amb}}\) can be determined provided \(\text{NO}_{\text{amb}}\) and \(\alpha\) are known. \(\text{NO}_{\text{amb}}\) is measured in the NO channel of the instrument and occasionally in the NO₂ channel when the shutter is closed. Provided there is good agreement between the NO and NO₂ channel measurements of \(\text{NO}_{\text{amb}}\), values of \(\text{NO}_{\text{amb}}\) from the NO channel are used to represent \(\text{NO}_{\text{amb}}\) in the NO₂ channel of the instrument when the shutter is open. The value of \(\alpha\) is

### Table 1. POLARIS Flights and Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight</th>
<th>Date a</th>
<th>Temperature, Latitude, SZA, Solar Exposure b</th>
<th>O₃, NO, NO₂, d NOₓ SA e ppmv</th>
<th>ppbv</th>
<th>ppbv</th>
<th>ppmv</th>
<th>µm² cm⁻³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deployment I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>April 22 f</td>
<td>195-211 14-37 10-72</td>
<td>0.55-0.61</td>
<td>0.2-2.6</td>
<td>0.2-0.8</td>
<td>0.1-0.6</td>
<td>0.7-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>April 24</td>
<td>210-227 37-66 41-54</td>
<td>0.53-0.65</td>
<td>0.5-3.2</td>
<td>0.2-0.6</td>
<td>0.1-0.9</td>
<td>1.6-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>April 26 f</td>
<td>214-229 60-90 57-77</td>
<td>0.58-0.80</td>
<td>1.3-3.4</td>
<td>0.1-1.0</td>
<td>0.3-1.6</td>
<td>4.1-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>April 30 f</td>
<td>225-230 64-65 72-101</td>
<td>0.59-0.71</td>
<td>1.0-2.7</td>
<td>0.1-0.2</td>
<td>0.3-0.6</td>
<td>3.4-8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>226-231 66-71 55-66</td>
<td>0.67-0.92</td>
<td>1.1-3.1</td>
<td>0.2-0.6</td>
<td>0.3-1.1</td>
<td>3.5-8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>May 6 f</td>
<td>226-234 65-79 53-63</td>
<td>0.75-1.00</td>
<td>1.0-3.3</td>
<td>0.2-0.7</td>
<td>0.3-1.3</td>
<td>3.5-10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7</td>
<td>May 9 f</td>
<td>227-229 64-65 78-98</td>
<td>0.76-0.93</td>
<td>1.0-2.8</td>
<td>0.2-0.3</td>
<td>0.4-1.0</td>
<td>3.4-8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>226-234 66-85 55-67</td>
<td>0.71-1.00</td>
<td>1.7-3.1</td>
<td>0.2-0.9</td>
<td>0.3-1.3</td>
<td>4.0-9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1</td>
<td>June 26</td>
<td>223-231 55-77 41-58</td>
<td>0.71-1.0</td>
<td>0.9-2.8</td>
<td>0.4-1.5</td>
<td>0.3-1.8</td>
<td>3.4-12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2</td>
<td>June 29</td>
<td>220-227 48-64 33-58</td>
<td>0.65-1.00</td>
<td>0.8-2.8</td>
<td>0.4-1.7</td>
<td>0.3-1.3</td>
<td>3.3-12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3</td>
<td>June 30 b</td>
<td>224-228 63-67 40-47</td>
<td>0.92-1.00</td>
<td>1.0-2.4</td>
<td>0.4-1.6</td>
<td>0.4-1.6</td>
<td>3.5-11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>218-230 48-71 27-58</td>
<td>0.61-1.00</td>
<td>0.8-2.7</td>
<td>0.3-1.5</td>
<td>0.2-1.9</td>
<td>2.7-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-5</td>
<td>July 7 f</td>
<td>227-233 65-90 54-68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.1-2.7</td>
<td>0.4-1.8</td>
<td>0.5-1.9</td>
<td>4.2-12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-6</td>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>225-229 63-66 41-57</td>
<td>0.81-0.90</td>
<td>1.1-2.7</td>
<td>0.4-1.3</td>
<td>0.4-1.2</td>
<td>4.3-11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1</td>
<td>Sept. 8</td>
<td>220-228 65-86 67-101</td>
<td>0.58-1.00</td>
<td>0.7-2.7</td>
<td>0.2-0.8</td>
<td>0.2-1.0</td>
<td>2.8-10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-2</td>
<td>Sept. 11 f</td>
<td>221-224 64-65 77-102</td>
<td>0.59-0.61</td>
<td>0.9-1.9</td>
<td>0.2-0.7</td>
<td>0.3-1.2</td>
<td>3.2-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-3</td>
<td>Sept. 14 f</td>
<td>217-221 64-65 66-102</td>
<td>0.51-0.57</td>
<td>0.6-2.0</td>
<td>0.4-1.5</td>
<td>0.3-0.7</td>
<td>2.6-8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-4</td>
<td>Sept. 15 f</td>
<td>219-222 64-65 66-103</td>
<td>0.53-0.55</td>
<td>0.5-2.1</td>
<td>0.0-0.9</td>
<td>0.3-1.2</td>
<td>1.8-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-5</td>
<td>Sept. 18</td>
<td>219-227 66-87 73-99</td>
<td>0.55-0.88</td>
<td>0.7-2.7</td>
<td>0.1-0.6</td>
<td>0.2-0.8</td>
<td>2.5-10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-6</td>
<td>Sept. 19</td>
<td>222-227 64-65 63-85</td>
<td>0.57-0.59</td>
<td>1.3-2.1</td>
<td>0.2-0.5</td>
<td>0.2-0.7</td>
<td>5.0-8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-7</td>
<td>Sept. 21</td>
<td>202-224 23-62 35-74</td>
<td>0.51-0.59</td>
<td>0.2-2.2</td>
<td>0.1-0.8</td>
<td>0.1-0.5</td>
<td>0.7-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-8</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>194-213 -3-20 0-67</td>
<td>0.50-0.55</td>
<td>0.1-1.7</td>
<td>0.2-0.6</td>
<td>0.1-0.3</td>
<td>0.4-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data except SZA and solar exposure are provided by instruments in Table 2.

a All dates refer to 1997 flights; flight lengths range from 4 to 8 hours.
b Solar zenith angle.
c Average fractional solar exposure received by a sampled air parcel over the previous five days as described in Results and Discussion section.
d Measurements by Aeronomy Laboratory photolysis/chemiluminescence system.
e Aerosol surface area density.
f Indicates a flight that is not included in Figure 4 because [NO₂]H₂O data were unavailable.
g Indicates a sunrise or sunset flight for which a substantial fraction of the data (at SZAs > 85°) have been removed from the analysis and comparisons shown in Plates 3 and 4.
h Indicates a flight that is not included in Plates 3 and 4 because HO₂ data were unavailable.
Table 2. ER-2 Instrument Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Sample Period, s</th>
<th>Uncertainty ±1 σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>chemiluminescence</td>
<td>Fahey et al. [1989]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>±6% + 4 pptv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NO2]HU</td>
<td>laser-induced fluorescence</td>
<td>K. K. Perkins et al. (manuscript in preparation, 1999a, b)</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>±10% ± 50 pptv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>UV absorption</td>
<td>Proffitt et al. [1989]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>±5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClO</td>
<td>resonance fluorescence</td>
<td>Brune et al. [1989]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>±15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO2</td>
<td>laser-induced fluorescence</td>
<td>Wennberg et al. [1994, 1995]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>±15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNO2</td>
<td>spectroradiometer</td>
<td>McElroy et al. [1995]</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>±15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>aircraft probe</td>
<td>Chan et al. [1989]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>±0.25 mbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>aircraft probe</td>
<td>Chan et al. [1989]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>±0.3 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2O</td>
<td>tunable diode laser</td>
<td>Loewenstein et al. [1989]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>±2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface area</td>
<td>optical particle counter</td>
<td>Jonsson et al. [1995]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>±60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

determined by adding NO2 calibration gas to the ambient sample in flight. The NO2 photolysis system has been used in previous campaigns with an estimated instrumental uncertainty range of 30 to 60% [Gao et al., 1994, 1997]. NO2 data used in the present analysis have an estimated instrumental uncertainty range from 10 to 30%. Characteristics of the system used during POLARIS, as well as the modifications to the instrument that resulted in this improved performance, are described briefly in the next sections.

2.1.1. UV lamp evaluation. The characteristics of the radiation reaching the cell from the photolysis lamp are shown in Figure 3. In addition to controlling the UV bandwidth reaching the photolysis cell, the color-glass filters also reduce the transmitted IR radiation, and therefore the resulting temperature of the photolysis cell and sample air. The filter configuration used in previous field campaigns consisted of a Pyrex© window, a 2-mm thick Schott UG-5 band-pass filter, and a 2-mm Schott WG-345 long-pass filter. The transmittance of each of these components is shown in Figure 3a. The addition of a 2-mm Schott WG-360 long-pass filter to the above configuration further limited transmittance of wavelengths in the 330 to 380 nm range. However, the four-filter configuration was found to severely limit the fraction of NO2 converted to NO without providing any significant advantages. In another test, a 2-mm Schott KG-4 color-glass filter was used to replace the Pyrex® window in the configuration. As shown in Figure 3a, the KG-4 filter provides lower transmittance than Pyrex® for wavelengths from 260 to 600 nm. Although not shown in Figure 3a, the KG-4 also provides significant reductions in the transmittance of wavelengths up to 5000 nm.

Two filter configurations were used during the POLARIS campaign. The initial configuration (KG-4, UG-5, and WG-360) was used for flights during Deployment I, while the final configuration (Pyrex®, UG-5, and WG-345) was used for all flights in Deployments II and III. The product of the transmittance of the filter set with the relative intensity of the Heraeus lamp, defined as the relative transmittance, is shown for both configurations in Figure 3b. In the initial configuration (short dashes), wavelengths from 345 to 410 nm were transmitted into the photolysis cell with a relative transmittance of approximately 1 or better. The peak in this curve is 43, which occurs at a wavelength of 370 nm. The corresponding value of α for this configuration was 0.36 to 0.38. In the final configuration (long dashes), the UV intensity reaching the cell was increased, leading to a peak value of 63 for the relative transmittance and giving α ranging from 0.48 to 0.56. The larger range in α for the final configuration is likely due to photoaging of the color-glass filters. Values of α began at 0.56 with new filters and dropped gradually with exposure time. Although the HNO3 photolysis rate was increased in the final configuration due to the increased transmittance of UV radiation, laboratory tests have indicated an upper limit of 0.002 for the conversion fraction of HNO3 to NO2. This upper limit corresponds to a maximum uncertainty in NO2 mixing ratios at cruise altitudes of ~4% for POLARIS flights.

2.1.2. NOamb loss and the addition of water vapor. In previous campaigns discrepancies in the value of NOamb were found between the NO and NO2 channels of
Table 3. NOAA AL NO2 Photolysis System Operational Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
<th>Range Over Useable POLARIS Flights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell pressure</td>
<td>60 mbar</td>
<td>59 - 62 mbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell temperature (external)</td>
<td>12.8°C</td>
<td>-5 - 28°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample air temperature</td>
<td>12°C</td>
<td>-10 - 22°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell volume</td>
<td>500 cm³</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell sample flow</td>
<td>968 sccmb</td>
<td>965 - 971 sccmb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence time</td>
<td>1.2 seconds</td>
<td>1.1 - 1.3 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO2 artifact in ZAirc</td>
<td>47 pptvd</td>
<td>20 - 76 pptvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO2 sensitivity</td>
<td>4.8 cps/pptve,f</td>
<td>4.7 - 5.1 cps/pptve,e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO2 conversion fraction</td>
<td>0.37f</td>
<td>0.36 - 0.38f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO2 sensitivity</td>
<td>0.52g</td>
<td>0.48 - 0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO sensitivity</td>
<td>12.3 cps/pptve</td>
<td>12.1 - 12.9 cps/pptve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O mixing ratio in sample line</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>± 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNO3 conversion fraction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;0.2%h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement Duty Cyclei</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55 - 68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncertainty Term

- Uncertainty in background: 3.1% - 0.8 - 27%
- Uncertainty due to NOamb: 7.9% - 0.7 - 33%
- Uncertainty due to NO2 channel (R2): 1.9% - 0.8 - 7.7%
- Uncertainty due to HNO3 photolysis: 2.2% - 1.1 - 3.8%
- Uncertainty due to absolute calibration: 6%

- ^a Varied with stratospheric ambient temperature.
- ^b Here sccm, standard cubic centimeters per minute. Calibrated before and after each deployment.
- ^c ZAir (or zero air) is synthetic air.
- ^d Dependent on ambient signal, frequency of cell washing, etc.
- ^e Here cps/pptv, counts per second per parts per trillion.
- ^f Initial filter configuration.
- ^g Final filter configuration.
- ^h Upper limit. Laboratory tests at limit of detection.
- ^i Percentage of time spent in ambient air measure mode (not zero or calibration).
- ^j Although discrepancies between channels were less than 10% in all cases, the corresponding uncertainty in the NO2 mixing ratio is a function of the ambient NO2/NO ratio.
- ^k Calculated for both NO and NO2 channels.

The instrument. These discrepancies added a relatively large uncertainty to measured NO2 mixing ratios and therefore were a primary focus for improving instrument performance. The discrepancy was determined to be due to a loss of NOamb in the NO2 channel of the instrument when the cell was exposed to the photolysis lamp. This loss was diagnosed from the transient behavior of the NOamb signal after the shutter was closed and by comparison to the NO channel signal. When the shutter was closed, initial values of NOamb were as much as 50% less than values obtained in the NO channel of the instrument. After a period of 100 to 300 s during which the NOamb signal in the NO2 channel rose dramatically, the NOamb signal returned to stable values equivalent to those in the NO channel of the instrument. This behavior indicated that little or no loss of NOamb was taking place in the dark photolysis cell. Therefore the loss process was associated with the photolytic radiation reaching the cell. In addition, because the residence time of ambient air in the photolysis cell is ~1.2 s, the relatively long time required for recovery of the NOamb signal indicated that the loss process most likely involved a surface reaction on the wall of the photolysis cell.

As noted above, 1-s sample values of NOamb from the NO channel are used in the calculation of NO2 mixing ratios. Because \( \alpha \) ranges from 0.3 to 0.5, differences in the response to NOamb between the NO and NO2 channels, and the associated uncertainties, are magnified by factors of 2 to 3 in the calculated NO2 mixing ratio. In the case of the discrepancy described above, values of NOamb from the NO channel (or from the shutter-closed NO2 channel once the signal had stabilized) were not representative of the actual NOamb response in the NO2 channel when the shutter was open. When low initial values of NOamb in the NO2 channel found after the shutter was closed were used to estimate the actual response to NOamb, these estimates were often inadequate, frequently generating negative mixing ratios for NO2, and always adding large uncertainties to reported NO2 mixing ratios.

In an attempt to correct this bias between the shutter-open and shutter-closed modes of the NO2 channel, the
Incorporated, and Heraeus Amersil Incorporated). (b) Relative photolysis quantum yield of NO from NO₂ (NO₂) in this wavelength region [DeMore et al., 1997]. The initial transmittance (defined as the product of the lamp relative intensity and the filter set transmittance) for the two sets of transmittance consists of the combination of KG-4, UG-5, and WG-360 filters, while the final configuration was composed of Pyrex®, UG-5, and WG-345 filters (see Figure 2).

The photolysis cell was tested in the laboratory to characterize the influence of UV bandwidth, sample temperature, reactions with ambient levels of O₃, and artifacts due to low-level HNO₃ photolysis. Despite the variety of tests performed, the loss of NOamb seen in flight could not be reproduced in the laboratory. In flight tests of the photolysis system before POLARIS in July, August, and December of 1996, loss of NOamb was found for each filter configuration discussed in the previous section. However, evidence of NO loss appeared only in the stratosphere and not in tropospheric flight legs of the ER-2. The differences suggested that an atmospheric constituent present with different abundances in the stratosphere than in the troposphere might be the cause. H₂O was a good candidate because it has a large gradient across the tropopause. Thus, the addition of water vapor to the sample flow upstream of the photolysis cell in flight was checked and found to significantly reduce the loss of NO within the cell during flights in the stratosphere. Specifically, the addition of approximately 2% H₂O by volume to the sample flow has been shown to effectively suppress the NOamb loss process without significantly reducing the sensitivity to NO₂ or NO. Although the specific role of H₂O vapor in reducing the loss of NO is not known, H₂O suppression of surface processes has a precedent in other atmospheric measurements. For example, H₂O vapor is used to reduce noise in the reaction vessel of chemiluminescence detectors [Drummond et al., 1985], and whole air samples are often taken in H₂O-passivated cans to prevent loss of more reactive species [Heidi, 1978]. All POLARIS flights included H₂O addition to the sample flow, significantly lowering the bias between shutter-open and shutter-closed modes in the NO₂ channel.

2.1.3. NO₂ Uncertainties. Small differences in the measurement of NOamb between the NO and NO₂ channels of the instrument remained during POLARIS but did not have a consistent bias and were much smaller than the 50% differences described above. Average differences were less than ±4%, with those in some isolated flight segments as high as 10%. The reduction in NOamb losses has significantly reduced the total uncertainty in the NO₂ measurement.

The total systematic uncertainty in the NO₂ mixing ratio has five components: background subtraction [Gao et al., 1994], subtraction of NOamb, reaction (R2) occurring in the temperature and pressure conditions of the sample line and photolysis cell, HNO₃ photolysis in the cell, and the absolute uncertainty associated with the concentration and delivery of the NO and NO₂ calibration gases. Thermal decomposition of NOy species in the photolysis cell can lead to interferences in the NO₂ measurement if the pressure or temperature in the cell is too high. Previous evaluations of N₂O₅, HO₂NO₂, and ClONO₂ in the laboratory have demonstrated the conditions under which such reactions may be a significant interference [Gao et al., 1994]. Similarly, interference due to photodissociation of NOy species other than HNO₃, such as ClONO₂, N₂O₅, and HO₂NO₂, is expected to be less than 5% for conditions in the lower stratosphere [Gao et al., 1994; DeMore et al., 1997]. No evidence of these reactive or photolytic interferences was found during the POLARIS campaign. The uncertainty in NO₂ due to photolysis of HNO₃ is a function of the NO₂/HNO₃ ratio. As a result, although the upper limit of this uncertainty was 4% for POLARIS, it may increase in future field campaigns if the value of the ratio is significantly lower than that for POLARIS. The contribution of each uncertainty listed above is given in Table 3 as a percentage of the calculated NO₂ mixing ratio. For a given flight, the estimated average uncertainty in NO₂ mixing ratios at cruise altitudes ranged from 10 to 21%, with larger values at higher pressures. No values with uncertainties larger than 30% are included in the present study.

2.2. Additional Measurements

An additional measurement of NO₂ was provided during POLARIS by the new Harvard University laser-induced fluorescence (LIF) detector for NO₂ ([NO₂]HU) [K. K. Perkins...
et al., manuscript in preparation, 1999a). Intercomparisons of measurements of NO₂ by the two systems show favorable results [K. K. Perkins et al., manuscript in preparation, 1999b]. For example, a comparison of the NO₂ mixing ratios for all POLARIS flights on which there were coincident measurements (see Table 1) is shown in Figure 4. The average difference between the two instruments is approximately 6%, a value well within the uncertainties of the individual measurements (see Table 2). The scatter in the data is likely due to the combination of instrument precision and atmospheric variability. Although the NOAA NO₂ ([NO₂]AL) values are used in all of the analyses presented here, the use of [NO₂]HU measurements would lead to similar conclusions.

Since measurements of BrO were unavailable during the POLARIS campaign, values were obtained from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) full-diurnal photochemical steady state (PSS) model that was run for points along each ER-2 flight track during POLARIS [Salawitch et al., 1994a, b]. The PSS model includes 35 reactive species and approximately 220 chemical reactions. The model assumes that each species reaches a balance between production and loss over 24 hours for the temperature, pressure, and latitude at which an air parcel was sampled. Calculated concentrations of radical species were constrained by ER-2 measurements of pressure, temperature, aerosol surface area, long-lived precursors of free radicals (e.g., H₂O, CH₄, NOy, Cl₂, Br₂ etc.), total column ozone as well as the ozone column above the ER-2 aircraft, and planetary albedo. The abundance of BrO was specified based on its correlation with CFC-11 [Wamsley et al., 1998]. For the values of BrO used here, the model was constrained by NO rather than NO₂ and used reaction rates and absorption cross sections from DeMore et al. [1997], except for the rates of OH + NO₂ + M [Dransfield et al., 1999], OH + HNO₃ [Brown et al., 1999], and a speculative HOx source discussed by Wennberg et al. [1999]. This model configuration was chosen for its improved ability to simulate observations of both NOx [Gao et al., 1999] and HOx [Wennberg et al., 1999], especially at high solar zenith angles (SZAs).

A summary of other measurements used in this analysis is given in Table 2. Pressure, temperature, and other meteorological and positional data were collected by the NASA Ames micrometeorological measurement system (MMS) on board the ER-2.

2.3. J_NO₂ Values

Spectrally resolved solar actinic flux was measured by the Composition and Photodissociative Flux Measurement (CPFM) instrument on board the ER-2 [McElroy, 1995; McElroy et al., 1995]. Using these flux data, the values of JNO₂ and other photodissociation rates were derived. CFPF values of JNO₂ (denoted JNO₂(CPFM)) are available for nearly all POLARIS flights at the 15% uncertainty level [McElroy et al., 1995].

The value of JNO₂ along the ER-2 flight track was also calculated from standard radiation models using a variety of environmental inputs and assumptions. Three such calculations of JNO₂ are compared in this analysis. All three were calculated with isotropic, spherical, multiple-scattering models of the atmospheric radiation field and incorporate temperature-dependent photolysis cross sections for NO₂. The first of these, provided by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) and denoted JNO₂[JPL-TOMS] [Prather, 1981], uses values of UV reflectivity (a surrogate for albedo) from version 7 Earth Probe Total Ozone Mapping Spectrometer (EP-TOMS) and climatological cloud heights from the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP) to calculate specific J values along the flight track. The partial ozone column above the ER-2 for the present study is most often estimated from CFPF data, and the total ozone column is constrained to match observations from TOMS. The other two calculations are provided by the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory (APL) [Anderson et al., 1995]. Both APL calculations use standard background aerosol climatologies described in the Air Force Geophysics Laboratory (now Phillips Laboratory) Handbook of Geophysics. Composite ozone profiles, one for each of the three deployments, were obtained from balloon ozonesondes launched from Fairbanks, Alaska, during the POLARIS campaign. The first of these calculations, denoted JNO₂(APL-TOMS), uses TOMS inputs for surface UV reflectivity as in the JPL calculation. The second, denoted JNO₂(APL-CPFM), uses albedo and overhead O₃ as measured by the CFPF as inputs to the calculation. For both model calculations, if the input albedo
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Figure 4. Comparison of all simultaneous NO₂ observations made by the NOAA Aeronomy Laboratory photolysis/chemiluminescence technique ([NO₂]AL) and the Harvard University laser-induced fluorescence technique ([NO₂]HU). [NO₂]AL data are 10 s averages of 1-s raw data; [NO₂]HU data are reported every 10 s. The solid line represents the 1:1 line; short-dashed lines represent the 2:1 and 1:2 lines. The best fit through the data (when forced through the origin) has a slope of 1.06 (long-dashed line).
was intermediate between that for terrain (0.08) and that for cloud (0.8), $J_{NO_2}$ was calculated as the linear combination of both the terrain-only (cloud-free) and cloud-only cases. The observed albedo was used to determine the fractional cloud cover. Because the horizontal resolution of CPFM measurements from the ER-2 is much better than that of the TOMS data, $J_{NO_2}(CPFM)$ and $J_{NO_2}(APLcCPF M)$ may exhibit differences due to local changes in cloud cover along the flight track that are not resolved by the TOMS satellite data. The uncertainty associated with calculated values of $J_{NO_2}$ is expected to be ~20% primarily due to uncertainties in the absorption cross section of NO$_2$ [DeMore et al., 1997].

The values of $J_{NO_2}$ found by the various models are highly correlated despite minor differences in the approaches. A comparison of $J_{NO_2}$ values for a single flight is given in Plate 1. As shown in the plate, there are differences between the various estimates of $J_{NO_2}$. The comparisons of $J_{NO_2}$ found by the various radiation field models demonstrate the uncertainty due to different assumptions concerning albedo, as well as possible differences between the models that seek to solve the same set of radiative transfer equations. The systematic difference between the CPFM estimate of $J_{NO_2}$ and that found from all of the radiation field models may indicate a problem either in the calculation or measurement of actinic flux. These differences lie within our estimate of 20% uncertainty for $J_{NO_2}$ used here. In addition, the $J_{NO_2}(CPFM)$ and $J_{NO_2}(APLcCPF M)$ results give values consistently lower than the other calculations. These differences are most likely related to parameters such as albedo or cloud height, which may have a significant effect on $J_{NO_2}$, rather than overhead O$_3$, which has very little impact. The comparison to $J_{NO_2,ss}$ will be discussed in more detail in a later section. However, it should be noted that the average difference between $J_{NO_2,ss}$ and values of $J_{NO_2}$ for flight #II-5 is among the largest seen during POLARIS. The average discrepancy for a given deployment or for the mission as a whole is lower, as shown later.

Plate 1. Values of $J_{NO_2}$ versus Greenwich Mean Time (s) for Flight #II-5 (see Table 1) as derived from several sources. $J_{NO_2,ss}$ is calculated using the steady state relationship in equation (2) and [NO$_2$]$_{AL}$ observations. Values of $J_{NO_2}(CPFM)$, $J_{NO_2}(APLcCPF M)$, $J_{NO_2}(JPLTOM S)$, and $J_{NO_2}(JPLTOM S)$ are interpolated to 100-second intervals; $J_{NO_2,ss}$ is calculated from 10-second data and averaged to 100-second intervals. The average difference between $J_{NO_2,ss}$ and each of the values of $J_{NO_2}$ for this flight is among the largest of all POLARIS flights (~7 to 18%).

Plate 2. Calculations and observations for flight #II-5 versus GMT (see Table 1). (a) Comparison of [NO$_2$]$_{ss}$ values as calculated from equation (1a) (red, dotted), (1c) (black), and (1d) (green). Results for (1b) are not shown because differences from (1a) are too small to discern. All calculations use $J_{NO_2}(APLcCPF M)$ as the NO$_2$ photolysis rate coefficient. (b) Ratio of results in Plate 2a: (1d/1a) (green); (1c/1a) (black). (c) Corresponding temperatures (red) and pressures (black) along the flight track. Values of [NO$_2$]$_{ss}$ and their ratios are calculated from 10-s data. Pressure and temperature are averaged to 10-s intervals.
2.4. \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) Calculations

In some previous evaluations of the NO/NO\(_2\) steady state, \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) was calculated using only (R1), (R2), and (R3) (equation (1c)) [Jaegle et al., 1994]. This treatment is expected to be valid based on the relative values of the (R4) and (R5) terms, which are significantly less than those of (R1)-(R3) [DeMore et al., 1997]. The relative contributions of the associated terms to the value of \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) for the Arctic spring, early summer, and late summer seasons have been evaluated using measured \(O_3\), \(ClO\), and HO\(_2\), and modeled BrO. For these calculations, 1-s \([\text{NO}_2]_{AL}\), \(O_3\), pressure, and temperature observations were averaged over 10 s. Values of \(J_{\text{NO}_2}\) (typically reported every 50 to 150 s), \(ClO\) (reported every 35 s), and modeled BrO (reported every 100 s) were interpolated to every 10 s. Values of HO\(_2\) were interpolated to 1-s data and averaged over 10 s to remove gaps in the reported data. Increased scatter in \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) may be expected from the interpolation because of local variations along the flight track that are not resolved.

The results for three calculations of \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) made for flight #II-5 are shown in Plate 2a. Ratios of the calculated values are shown in Plate 2b. Because (R3)-(R5) all represent NO loss processes and \(J_{\text{NO}_2}\) is the same in each calculation, relative differences in the value of \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) for each calculation are equivalent to relative differences in the total loss of NO. From these ratios it is shown that the combined contribution of the HO\(_2\) and BrO terms to the total NO loss is less than 2.5% over the entire flight track. In contrast, the combined contribution of the ClO, HO\(_2\), and BrO terms ranges from 4 to 8%. The average results for each season are shown in Table 4.

The contribution of the HO\(_2\) and BrO terms has been evaluated previously as part of the error analysis by Jaegle et al. [1994] to be <1% and approximately 2%, respectively, at Northern Hemisphere midlatitudes, consistent with the results shown in Table 4. BrO values in the Jaegle et al. [1994] study were estimated from a climatology developed by Wennberg et al. [1994] based on in situ observations. In evaluations of \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) for the Southern Hemisphere (45°S - 68°S), Gao et al. [1997] found an average BrO contribution of approximately 3%. In the Gao et al. [1997] study, BrO values were estimated from compact relationships between BrO and CFC-11 and between CFC-11 and N\(_2\)O [Woodbridge et al., 1995]. Each of these studies, including the results presented here, indicates that BrO and HO\(_2\) do not make a large contribution to the value of \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\). The contributions of each of these terms may become more significant under specific conditions. For example, during the polar winter when mixing ratios of ClO are significantly elevated due to heterogeneous processing, the contribution of this term to the expression will become more competitive with the \(O_3\) term. Similarly, at altitudes closer to the tropopause where the relative mixing ratios of inorganic chlorine species decrease substantially, the contribution of the HO\(_2\) term to the expression may become competitive with that of ClO. Therefore, despite the small contribution from these terms, \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) is calculated using all terms (equation (1a)) in the remaining analysis for completeness.

### Table 4. Fractional Contributions to \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) From Terms in Equation (1a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>POLARIS Deployment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April/May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R3) ClO</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R4) BrO</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R5) HO(_2) (b)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R3)-(R5) all</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributions are in percent.

* Flights listed in Table 1.

b Seasonal differences in the contribution of the HO\(_2\) term are not statistically significant.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) Evaluation

A comparison of \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) with \([\text{NO}_2]_{AL}\) for flight #II-5 is shown in Figure 5. The slope of the unweighted linear fit through all points for that flight indicates that \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) is 16% higher than \([\text{NO}_2]_{AL}\) on average. As found in the previous studies noted above, the average difference between \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) and measured NO\(_2\) is within the combined instrumental and model uncertainties (as discussed below). In addition, as noted above for Plate 1, discrepancies for this flight are among the largest of all POLARIS flights.

The comparison in Figure 5 shows the discrepancy for a single flight when \([\text{NO}_2]_{ss}\) is calculated using
The average results for all of POLARIS are shown separately in Plate 3 for all four sets of JNO2 values. The validity of equations (1a)-(1d) is generally limited to solar zenith angles (SZAs) <85°. At higher SZAs the magnitude of JNO2 is considerably smaller than at low SZAs, and the rate of change of JNO2 is considerably larger. The combination of these changes for POLARIS sampling conditions results in an imbalance in NO2 production and loss rates, making the steady state assumption invalid in many cases. As a result, the data set shown in Plate 3 only includes data taken when SZA <85°. The slopes of the linear fits to the data shown in Plate 3 indicate that average differences between [NO2]ss and [NO2]AL for the whole campaign range from 4 to 19% for all J values used. JNO2(JPLToMS) values are consistent with JNO2 values used by Gao et al. [1997], although improvements in the radiation field model and its inputs makes them slightly different. The results of the [NO2]ss comparison in the Gao et al. [1997] study and the results of the comparison using JNO2(JPLToMS) in the present study are also consistent. In the present study, values of [NO2]ss exceed [NO2]AL by 7% on average when JNO2(JPLToMS) is used, while the Gao et al., [1997] study found differences of approximately 8%. However, if a different value of JNO2 is used in the calculation, the discrepancies between [NO2]ss and [NO2]AL appear either larger (JNO2(CPFM) and JNO2(APLToPFM)) or smaller (JNO2(APLToPFM)). Because albedo and cloud height are expected to have a stronger influence on values of NO2 than overhead ozone, values of JNO2(CPFM) and JNO2(CPFM) (Plate 3a and 3c) are expected to show strong similarities, as are JNO2(JPLToMS) and JNO2(JPLToMS) (Plate 3b and 3d). In all cases, the range of agreement with different J values falls within the expected 20% uncertainty in calculated JNO2. Average differences are smaller when comparisons are made using [NO2]HU data. In such comparisons, linear fits to the available data set (see Table 1) show discrepancies ranging from -5 to 6%. In addition, both NO2 data sets show similar nonlinearities and seasonal differences in comparisons with [NO2]ss, as discussed later.

The color scale shown in Plate 3 indicates the average fractional solar exposure for the last 5 days of an air parcel's history. The solar exposure parameter is calculated using each air parcel's 5-day back trajectory (Goddard Space Flight Center trajectory model output) and integrating the fraction of time spent at SZA <93°. Thus an air parcel at the equator experiencing a typical diurnal cycle of illumination would have an average solar exposure of 0.5, while air parcels experiencing continuous sunlight will have a solar exposure of 1.0. As noted above in the discussion related to Figure 1, continuous solar illumination is expected to enhance mixing ratios of NO2 relative to total NOy. The average NO2 value at cruise altitudes is similar for all three POLARIS deployments (Table 1). The comparisons in Plate 3 show that the highest values of NO2 occur in air parcels that experience continuous sunlight, in agreement with expectations. Although solar exposure is not expected to affect the NO2/NO steady state, this parameter is used to highlight the data corresponding to these unique photochemical conditions.

The black points in Plate 3 represent averages of 2000 data points, each of which represents 10 s of in situ data. The vertical and horizontal bars correspond to the 1-σ standard deviation of [NO2]ss and [NO2]AL values, respectively, contained in the average. From these averaged data, the curvature in the relationship between [NO2]ss and [NO2]AL becomes apparent. At low values of [NO2]AL (0.0 to 0.5 ppbv), [NO2]ss values are greater than [NO2]AL by 5 to 14% using JNO2(CPFM) (Plate 3c). At higher values of [NO2]AL (1.0 to 1.5 ppbv), [NO2]ss exceeds [NO2]AL by as much as 18 to 24% for this comparison. Similarly, average discrepancies range from -7 to 3% at values of 0.0 to 0.5 ppbv using JNO2(APLToMS), JNO2(APLToPFM), and JNO2(JPLToMS) (Plate 3a, 3b, and 3d) but range from 5 to 12% at values of 1.0 to 1.5 ppbv. These results are consistent with the study of Gao et al. [1997] in which mixing ratios of NO2 were typically less than 0.5 ppbv. A similar curvature exists when comparisons are made of [NO2]ss with [NO2]HU (-7% at low values, -2% at high values). Moreover, the relationship between [NO2]AL and [NO2]HU appears to be linear over this range, indicating that a systematic NO2 measurement error is an unlikely source of this nonlinearity.

Despite the coincidence of points with large discrepancies and high solar exposures, solar exposure cannot conclusively be linked to any systematic impact on discrepancies between [NO2]ss values and measured values. Points corresponding to a solar exposure of 1.0 arise predominantly from flights during Deployment II of POLARIS, although some flights during Deployments I and III reached solar exposures of 1.0. However, even high solar exposure data from Deployments I and III have smaller average discrepancies than similar data from Deployment II. Thus while there are seasonal differences in the magnitude of the discrepancy between [NO2]ss and [NO2]AL, these differences do not appear to be directly related to solar exposure. Similar seasonal differences are noted in comparisons using [NO2]HU.

3.2. JNO2,ss

The steady state expression shown in equation (2) for calculation of JNO2,ss was also evaluated. The results for flight MI-5 using [NO2]AL are shown in Plate 1. JNO2,ss is greater than the other calculated values of JNO2 by 7 to 18%, depending on the specific J value used in the comparison. This result is consistent with the fact that values of [NO2]ss are higher than measured values by 8 to 19% for this flight (Figure 5).

The combined results for JNO2,ss are shown in Plate 4. As in Plate 3, the linear fit for each comparison is shown by the red line, and data are selected for SZA <85°, for which the steady state expression is expected to be valid. The colored points represent average values for individual flights with horizontal and vertical bars representing the 1-σ standard deviation of JNO2 and JNO2,ss values, respectively, for that
flight. Mean discrepancies (from the slope of the linear fits) between $J_{NO_2}$ and derived values of $J_{NO_2}$ are smaller than discrepancies seen in comparisons of $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and $[NO_2]_{AL}$. However, the range of discrepancies is magnified in Plate 4 by the smaller dynamic range of $J_{NO_2}$ compared to $[NO_2]$. Owing to this magnification, the magnitude of the discrepancy varies more between flights than within a given flight. By comparing deployments in Plate 4 (colored points), seasonal differences are apparent in the comparisons of $J_{NO_2}$ as in the comparisons of $[NO_2]$. In the $J_{NO_2}(APL-TOMS)$ case (Plate 4b), for which the linear fit indicates minimal differences with $J_{NO_2}$ ($\pm 1\%$), the six flights from Deployment II have average differences of $\pm 8\%$, balancing average differences of $\pm 3\%$ for flights during Deployments I and III. The summer period during POLARIS is characterized by relatively higher solar exposure, lower solar zenith angles, and higher levels of NO and NO$_2$ in comparison to the other seasons sampled. In addition, due to the extended illumination, temperature is also elevated somewhat during the summer period, leading to an increased rate for (R2). The combination of all of these parameters in affecting calculations of $J_{NO_2}$ precludes a simple identification of the source or sources of the seasonal differences. Further analysis of the seasonal differences is provided in a later section.

3.3. Estimated Uncertainties

Uncertainties for the individual measurements used in the calculation of $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and $[NO_2]_{AL}$ are given in Table 2. BrO values from the PSS model depend, in part, on whether the model is constrained by values of NO or NO$_2$ because of the well-documented difficulties in simulating the observed NO/NO$_2$ ratio [Gao et al., 1999; Osterman et al., 1999]. The NO-constrained model gives BrO values that are consistently $\sim 17\%$ greater than the NO$_2$-constrained BrO values for all POLARIS flights. As noted previously, for this analysis an NO-constrained model run was used for BrO. A previous study by Avallone et al. [1995] indicated that photochemical model calculations tend to overestimate the BrO fraction of Br$_2$ by as much as $25\%$. The uncertainty associated with BrO in this study is estimated to be $\pm 25\%$.

Systematic errors in the values of BrO and HO$_2$ have relatively little influence on the value of $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and cannot account for the discrepancies of 4 to 19% found between $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and $[NO_2]_{AL}$. The BrO and HO$_2$ terms in equation (1a) are at least an order of magnitude smaller than the other terms in the expression. Thus even 15 to 20% changes to these mixing ratios will have less than a 1% effect on calculated values of $[NO_2]_{ss}$. Similarly, the 15% uncertainty associated with the ClO mixing ratio has little impact on the comparison. The ClO term becomes most competitive with the O$_3$ term at the lowest temperatures, making a maximum contribution to the uncertainty of $4\%$ at 195 K and $<1\%$ at 235 K. Systematic errors in the mixing ratios of NO and O$_3$ potentially could make a 4 to 6% difference in the comparison, but cannot account for discrepancies of $19\%$. Values of NO$_2$ and $J_{NO_2}$ have a more direct influence on the agreement between $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and $[NO_2]_{AL}$, and the uncertainties associated with these values are sufficient to account for the average discrepancies found in each comparison.

In addition to the uncertainties associated with radical mixing ratios, there are significant uncertainties associated with the rate coefficients for (R2)–(R5). For the temperatures encountered during POLARIS (195 to 235 K) the uncertainty for these rate coefficients ranges from 59 to 80% [DeMore et al., 1997], much larger than that estimated for any of the radical measurements, values of $J_{NO_2}$, or modeled BrO. As a result, the rate coefficient uncertainty is the dominant contribution to the uncertainty in each term in the numerator of equations (1a) and (2). The largest contribution to the total uncertainty in the calculation of $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and $[NO_2]_{ss}$ is that associated with (R2) ($k_2$[O$_3$]). The recommended uncertainty in the value of $k_2$ is $\pm 59$ to $70\%$ at POLARIS temperatures [DeMore et al., 1997]. Because the value of the (R2) term is generally an order of magnitude larger than the (R3)–(R5) terms, this uncertainty outweighs all others.

The previous study by Jaeglé et al. [1994] suggested that reducing the recommended rate coefficient for (R2) by 35% (or by $25\%$ with a $15\%$ increase in $J_{NO_2}$) would allow steady state and measured concentrations of NO$_2$ to be reconciled. Gao et al. [1997] found agreement between $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and $[NO_2]_{AL}$ to be within $8\%$ and determined that large changes to rate coefficients and photolysis rates were unnecessary. The comparisons presented here are in agreement with the Gao et al. [1997] study. Sen et al. [1998] examined the laboratory observations used in the DeMore et al. [1997] evaluation of this rate and concluded that it was difficult to rule out the possibility that the actual rate of (R2) is $15\%$ faster than the DeMore et al. [1997] rate for temperatures near 216 K. This faster rate would lead to better agreement between models and the MkIV measurements of NO and NO$_2$ but would worsen the agreement found here. Any change to $k_2$ or $J_{NO_2}$ that effectively corrects the comparison for POLARIS data from Deployments I and III will not remove the discrepancy noted for Deployment II (see next section).

The recommended value of $k_2$ is based on the results of five independent laboratory studies with stated uncertainties of $\pm 10$ to $20\%$ [DeMore et al., 1997, and references therein; see also Sen et al., 1998, Figure 7]. At 298 K, the range of the five values of $k_2$ falls within these uncertainties. However, at the lower temperatures encountered during POLARIS the range in laboratory determinations of $k_2$ increases to $\pm 22$ to $40\%$ relative to the recommended value. Although these uncertainties are accounted for in the DeMore et al. [1997] estimate of the uncertainty of $k_2$, using $k_2$ from one of the five studies in place of the recommended rate coefficient results in significant differences in the calculated value of $[NO_2]_{ss}$ or $J_{NO_2}$. For example, using the fit recommended by Borders and Birks [1982] in which curvature in the temperature dependence of $k_2$ was measured results in average discrepancies of $+21\%$ between $[NO_2]_{ss}$ and $[NO_2]_{AL}$. A new expression for $k_2$ was recently
measured at tropospheric temperatures and pressures by Moonen et al. [1998] in response to discrepancies in the partitioning of NO and NO₂ in tropospheric field studies. Using this new expression for $k_2$ yields average discrepancies between [NO₂]ₚₛ and [NO₂]ₚ of -17% due to a higher value for the Arrhenius parameter and a smaller positive temperature dependence. Both the Borders and Birks [1982] and the Moonen et al. [1998] studies included measurements down to 200 to 205 K, and the values of $k_2$ calculated using these expressions represent the high and low extremes, respectively, for temperatures encountered during POLARIS. Significant improvements can be made in our evaluation of the steady state relationship between NO and NO₂ if the uncertainty of the rate coefficient of (R2) can be reduced.

When the uncertainties in the rate coefficients for (R2)-(R5) and the values of the radical species and JNO₂ are combined, the ±1-σ uncertainty in [NO₂]ₚₛ ranges from ±49 to 64% for the pressure and temperature conditions encountered during POLARIS. JNO₂ₚₛ has a similar uncertainty, ranging from ±54 to 68%. These error estimates do not include a small reduction in uncertainty expected due to the common calibration standard used for the NO and NO₂ channels of the NOAA instrument (~1 to 3%). The agreement shown in all comparisons in this analysis falls well within these estimated uncertainty ranges.

### 3.4. Seasonal Differences in [NO₂]ₚₛ and JNO₂ₚₛ

Despite the general agreement between [NO₂]ₚₛ and measured NO₂ (and between JNO₂ₚₛ and measured or modeled JNO₂), the source of the seasonal differences noted in the discussions of Plates 3 and 4 remains unidentified. No changes in instrument sensitivity, background signal, or absolute calibration have been found that can explain a systematic difference of <10% in the measurements of NO₂, [NO₂]ₚ, or [NO₂]ₚ between deployments. As noted above, because similar systematic behavior appears in two independent measurements of NO₂, measurement error in NO₂ seems an unlikely explanation. Interference due to thermal decomposition of other NOₓ species, which could potentially be a factor in both NO₂ measurements, would cause NO₂ values to be overestimated. This interference would be most apparent in the early summer deployment due to elevated ambient temperatures, yet the comparison with [NO₂]ₚₛ indicates the opposite behavior. The similarity of the seasonal dependence of the discrepancy for all four values of JNO₂ cannot be used to rule out the possibility that uncertainty in JNO₂ is the cause of the seasonal differences. However, any source of the seasonal differences must arise from a parameter common to all four calculations, such as the temperature dependence of the NO₂ cross section or problems with the measurement of albedo at low values. Other physical reasons for the difference between deployments are difficult to distinguish. Since the rates of (R1) and (R2) have the largest effect on the value of [NO₂]ₚₛ, the effect of season on these rates was evaluated in detail. Plate 5 shows the ratio [NO₂]ₚₛ/[NO₂]ₚ as a function of temperature. In this plate, the discrepancies between [NO₂]ₚₛ and [NO₂]ₚ are shown by deviations of [NO₂]ₚₛ/[NO₂]ₚ from unity (black line). As shown in Plate 5a, the largest positive discrepancies are associated with the highest temperatures. This apparent dependence on temperature also correlates well with the rate of (R2) as shown in the color scale. Because (R2) has a positive temperature dependence, the highest temperatures correspond to the fastest production of NO₂, in the same direction as the discrepancy. A linear fit to the data in Plate 5a gives a slope of 0.007 ($r^2 = 0.5$; $r^2$ is the linear correlation coefficient for which values of 1 indicate complete correlation, while values near zero indicate no correlation), corresponding to a 7% increase in the discrepancy for every 10 K increase in temperature. As shown in Plate 5b, the largest positive discrepancies are also associated primarily with Deployment II, making it difficult to define a single temperature dependence for the entire data set. Linear fits to the data for individual deployments give slopes that range from 0.002 to 0.012 ($r^2 < 0.4$ in all cases), with Deployment II showing the strongest dependence. Thus, the small apparent temperature dependence is not statistically significant.

A similar comparison is shown in Plate 6, with [NO₂]ₚₛ/[NO₂]ₚ plotted as a function of SZA. The apparent curvature in this relationship at SZA > 60° (Plate 6a) is removed when the data are separated by deployment. Points corresponding to Deployment II appear to be offset from the remaining data (Plate 6a). However, there is no overall dependence of the ratio on SZA. In addition, using the color scale for Plate 6a, no significant correlation with JNO₂ is apparent in this relationship. Similar comparisons were made for a variety of other parameters. No direct dependence could be discerned for albedo, overhead O₃, pressure, or potential temperature; or for mixing ratios of O₃, NO₂, ClO, BrO, and NO₂. Although there may be a small dependence on temperature or the rate of (R2), the magnitude of the dependence is not statistically significant or uniform for all deployments, and therefore a cause of the seasonal differences in the [NO₂]ₚₛ comparison cannot be identified here.

The contribution to equation (1a) of other reactions not considered here remains a possibility to explain the seasonal differences. Recent studies have addressed the possibility that heterogeneous reactions of NO₂ on aerosol surfaces may play a role in the stratosphere [Gao et al., 1998; Langenberg et al., 1998; Lary et al., 1997; Kleffman et al., 1998; Rogaski et al., 1997; Tabor et al., 1994]. These studies have focused primarily on the direct production of NO through reaction of NO₂ on soot surfaces and the reaction of NO₂ on sulfate surfaces to produce HONO, which photolyzes to produce NO. Lary et al. [1997] proposed that reactions of NO₂ on soot surfaces could be an additional mechanism for production of NO and, indirectly, loss of O₃. Gao et al. [1998] have used in situ observations in a Concorde aircraft plume to derive an upper limit for this reaction rate. Using a reactive uptake coefficient (γNO₂) of
Plate 3. Cross plot of [NO$_2$]$_{ss}$ calculated using equation (1a) and [NO$_2$]$_{AL}$ for all available POLARIS flights (see Table 1). Values of [NO$_2$]$_{ss}$ are calculated using J$_{NO2}$ from (a) J$_{NO2}$(APL-CFMM), (b) J$_{NO2}$(APL-TOMS), (c) J$_{NO2}$(CPFM), and (d) J$_{NO2}$(JPL-TOMS). Each panel contains approximately 30,000 data points. Data are reported every 10 s and selected for SZA < 85° and (50 mbar < pressure < 100 mbar). Red lines represent the best linear fit through the data for each comparison when constrained to pass through the origin. (J$_{NO2}$(CPFM) data have been filtered to remove extreme outliers.) Black lines represent the 1:1 correlation line (solid) and the 1:2 and 2:1 correlation lines (dashed). The color of individual points represents the associated average fractional solar exposure of the air mass over 5 days prior to sampling, as designated in the color scale. Black points represent 2000-point averages of both [NO$_2$]$_{ss}$ and [NO$_2$]$_{AL}$ values. Vertical and horizontal bars on these points represent the 1-$\sigma$ standard deviation of data contained in the average.
Plate 4. Cross plot of $J_{NO_2,ss}$ calculated using equation (2) for all available POLARIS flights and $J_{NO_2}$ from (a) $J_{NO_2}$(APL-CFFM), (b) $J_{NO_2}$(APL-TOMS), (c) $J_{NO_2}$(CPF), and (d) $J_{NO_2}$(JPL-TOMS). Each panel contains approximately 30,000 data points. Data are 10-s averages selected for SZA < 85° and (50 mbar < pressure < 100 mbar). Red lines represent the best linear fit through the data for each comparison when constrained to pass through the origin. ($J_{NO_2}$(CPF) data have been filtered to remove extreme outliers.) The colored points represent average values for individual flights and vertical and horizontal bars represent the 1-σ standard deviation of $J_{NO_2,ss}$ and $J_{NO_2}$ values, respectively, that are included in the average. The colors represent deployment I (spring, red), deployment II (early summer, green), and deployment III (late summer, purple).
Plate 5. Ratio of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{SS}}$ and $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{AL}}$ values plotted as a function of temperature. Data are 10-s averages selected for SZA < 85° and (50 mbar < pressure < 100 mbar). (a) Colored points show the associated rate of reaction (R2) using the color scale at the top. (b) Colors represent the corresponding POLARIS deployment (Table 1).

Plate 6. Ratio of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{SS}}$ and $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{AL}}$ values plotted as a function of SZA. Data are 10-s averages selected for SZA < 85° and (50 mbar < pressure < 100 mbar). (a) Colored points show the value of $J_{\text{NO}_2}$ as shown in the color scale at the top. (b) Colors represent the corresponding POLARIS deployment (Table 1).
1.7 x 10^{-5}, derived by Gao et.al. [1998] and soot surface area densities derived from Blake and Kato [1995] for the background stratosphere, the time constant for this reaction in the lower stratosphere under conditions observed during POLARIS would be of the order of years. The $\gamma_{\text{NO}_2}$ value derived by Gao et al. [1998] was significantly lower than that used in the modeling study by Larry et al. [1997]. However, even using the maximum values proposed by Larry et al. [1997], the time constant for this reaction is still greater than 12 hours at stratospheric conditions. Therefore inclusion of this reaction would not alter the steady state values for NO$_2$ found here.

The heterogeneous reaction of NO$_2$ occurring on the surface of sulfate aerosols to produce HONO also does not affect the NO$_2$ steady state expression due to the relatively long time constant for formation of NO via this process. The inclusion of this process in the calculation of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ makes a statistically insignificant (<<1%) difference. Similarly, for background aerosol conditions all heterogeneous reactions of NO$_2$ on sulfate generally can be neglected in the steady state expression. For example, since the POLARIS campaign took place during a volcanically quiescent period in the lower stratosphere, sulfate surface area densities did not exceed 4 $\mu$m$^2$ cm$^{-3}$. The expression for a heterogeneous rate coefficient takes the general form:

$$k_{\text{het}} = \gamma_{\text{NO}_2} \frac{(v)}{4} SA$$

where $(v)$ is the average velocity of an NO$_2$ radical at stratospheric temperatures and pressures, and SA is the sulfate surface area density. Assuming that every collision of NO$_2$ with a sulfate surface leads to reaction and formation of NO ($\gamma_{\text{NO}_2} = 1$) and SA = 4 $\mu$m$^2$ cm$^{-3}$, a heterogeneous reaction can only make a 3% change in values of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ when compared with minimum values of J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ at SZA < 85° ($\approx 0.007$ s$^{-1}$). When J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ is larger, the impact of heterogeneous reactions will be smaller. Therefore such reactions could not account for the seasonal differences or the 4 to 18% average discrepancies in the POLARIS results.

4. Conclusions

In situ measurements of NO, NO$_2$, O$_3$, ClO, and HO$_2$ have been obtained in the lower stratosphere (18 to 20 km) over a latitude range of 3°S to 90°N. The bulk of these measurements were made between 60°N and 90°N during the spring, early summer, and late summer seasons as part of the 1997 POLARIS field campaign. Steady state values of NO$_2$ ($[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$) were calculated (equations (1a)-(1d)) using simultaneous observations of NO, O$_3$, HO$_2$, and ClO, gas phase reaction rate coefficient data, and J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ (the photolysis rate coefficient of NO$_2$). Values of J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ used were either derived from spectroradiometer observations or calculated from radiation field models. Values of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ differ from measured values by up to 25% with average discrepancies between +4 and +8% when values of J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ from radiation field models are used in the calculation. Average discrepancies are larger (+19%) when values of J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ are obtained from spectroradiometer observations. In all comparisons, the largest discrepancies are found at the highest values of NO$_2$. These differences are considerably smaller than the uncertainties associated with the calculation of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ (-50 to 70%). An additional comparison was made between values of J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ as calculated from the in situ measurements (J$_{\text{NO}_2,ss}$) and the four values of J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ derived from the spectroradiometer and radiation field models. Average discrepancies between J$_{\text{NO}_2,ss}$ and J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ were smaller than in the $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ comparisons (1 to 14%), though the range of the discrepancies was larger. As in the case of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$, discrepancies between J$_{\text{NO}_2,ss}$ and J$_{\text{NO}_2}$ fell within the uncertainty associated with the calculation. A reduction in the uncertainty in the rate coefficient of NO + O$_3$ (R2) would significantly reduce the uncertainty in calculated values of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ and $J_{\text{NO}_2,ss}$.

Seasonal differences in the discrepancy between steady state and measured NO$_2$ values were found using the POLARIS data, with larger discrepancies in the early summer season than in spring or late summer. The cause of these differences has not been identified. The consistency between comparisons using two independent measurements of NO$_2$ suggests that NO$_2$ measurement error is an unlikely cause of the seasonal differences.

In comparison with previous studies, the POLARIS results extend the evaluation of $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ to a wider range of values of NO$_2$ and J$_{\text{NO}_2}$, as well as other species important for the partitioning of NO and NO$_2$. Collectively, the results presented here and in previous studies indicate that average values of NO$_2$ and $[\text{NO}_2]_{\text{ss}}$ consistently agree within 25% for a broad range of conditions sampled in the sunlit lower stratosphere between the tropics and the pole in both hemispheres.
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