

[Home](#)[Online Library ACP](#)[Recent Final Revised Papers](#)[Volumes and Issues](#)[Special Issues](#)[Library Search](#)[Title and Author Search](#)[Online Library ACPD](#)[Alerts & RSS Feeds](#)[General Information](#)[Submission](#)[Review](#)[Production](#)[Subscription](#)[Comment on a Paper](#)

Impact
Factor
4.865

ISI
indexed

[Volumes and Issues](#) [Contents of Issue 9](#)

Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 2401-2410, 2006

www.atmos-chem-phys.net/6/2401/2006/

© Author(s) 2006. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons License.

In-situ comparison of the NO_y instruments flown in MOZAIC and SPURT

H.-W. Pätz¹, A. Volz-Thomas¹, M. I. Hegglin², D. Brunner², H. Fischer³, and U. Schmidt⁴

¹Institut für Chemie und Dynamik der Geosphäre II: Troposphäre, Forschungszentrum Jülich, Germany

²Institute for Atmospheric and Climate Science, ETH-Zürich, Switzerland

³Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz, Germany

⁴Institut für Atmosphäre und Umwelt, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt, Germany

Abstract. Two aircraft instruments for the measurement of total odd nitrogen (NO_y) were compared side by side aboard a Learjet A35 in April 2003 during a campaign of the AFO2000 project SPURT (Spurengastransport in der Tropopausenregion). The instruments albeit employing the same measurement principle (gold converter and chemiluminescence) had different inlet configurations. The ECO-Physics instrument operated by ETH-Zürich in SPURT had the gold converter mounted outside the aircraft, whereas the instrument operated by FZ-Jülich in the European project MOZAIC III (Measurements of ozone, water vapour, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides aboard Airbus A340 in-service aircraft) employed a Rosemount probe with 80 cm of FEP-tubing connecting the inlet to the gold converter. The NO_y concentrations during the flight ranged between 0.3 and 3 ppb. The two data sets were compared in a blind fashion and each team followed its normal operating procedures. On average, the measurements agreed within 7%, i.e. within the combined uncertainty of the two instruments. This puts an upper limit on potential losses of HNO₃ in the Rosemount inlet of the MOZAIC instrument. Larger transient deviations were observed during periods after calibrations and when the aircraft entered the stratosphere. The time lag of the MOZAIC instrument observed in these instances is in accordance with the time constant of the MOZAIC inlet line determined in the laboratory for HNO₃.

[Final Revised Paper](#) (PDF, 1284 KB) [Discussion Paper](#) (ACPD)

Citation: Pätz, H.-W., Volz-Thomas, A., Hegglin, M. I., Brunner, D., Fischer, H., and Schmidt, U.: In-situ comparison of the NO_y instruments flown in MOZAIC and SPURT, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 2401-2410, 2006. [Bibtex](#) [EndNote](#) [Reference Manager](#)

[Search ACP](#)

Library Search

Author Search

[News](#)

- [Sister Journals AMT & GMD](#)
- [Financial Support for Authors](#)
- [Journal Impact Factor](#)
- [Public Relations & Background Information](#)

[Recent Papers](#)

01 | ACPD, 12 Jan 2009:
Mobile mini-DOAS
measurement of the
emission of NO₂ and HCHO
from Mexico City

02 | ACP, 12 Jan 2009:
Spatial distribution of Δ¹⁴C
across Eurasia:
measurements from the
TROICA-8 expedition

03 | ACP, 12 Jan 2009:
Cloud's Center of Gravity – a
compact approach to analyze
convective cloud
development