

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 5](#)

Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 1831-1845, 2009

www.atmos-chem-phys.net/9/1831/2009/

© Author(s) 2009. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.

Comparison of tropospheric gas-phase chemistry schemes for use within global models

K. M. Emmerson and M. J. Evans

School of Earth & Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

Abstract. Methane and ozone are two important climate gases with significant tropospheric chemistry. Within chemistry-climate and transport models this chemistry is simplified for computational expediency. We compare the state of the art Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM) with six tropospheric chemistry schemes (CRI-reduced, GEOS-CHEM and a GEOS-CHEM adduct, MOZART-2, TOMCAT and CBM-IV) that could be used within composition transport models. We test the schemes within a box model framework under conditions derived from a composition transport model and from field observations from a regional scale pollution event. We find that CRI-reduced provides much skill in simulating the full chemistry, yet with greatly reduced complexity. We find significant variations between the other chemical schemes, and reach the following conclusions. 1) The inclusion of a gas phase $\text{N}_2\text{O}_5 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ reaction in one scheme and not others is a large source of uncertainty in the inorganic chemistry. 2) There are significant variations in the calculated concentration of PAN between the schemes, which will affect the long range transport of reactive nitrogen in global models. 3) The representation of isoprene chemistry differs hugely between the schemes, leading to significant uncertainties on the impact of isoprene on composition. 4) Differences are found in NO_3 concentrations in the nighttime chemistry. Resolving these four issues through further investigative laboratory studies will reduce the uncertainties within the chemical schemes of global tropospheric models.

[Final Revised Paper](#) (PDF, 4048 KB) [Discussion Paper](#) (ACPD)

Citation: Emmerson, K. M. and Evans, M. J.: Comparison of tropospheric gas-phase chemistry schemes for use within global models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 1831-1845, 2009. [Bibtex](#) [EndNote](#) [Reference Manager](#)

Copernicus Publications
The Innovative Open Access Publisher

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 Mar 2009:
A new insight on tropospheric methane in the Tropics – first year from IASI hyperspectral infrared observations

02 | ACP, 12 Mar 2009:
HOCl chemistry in the Antarctic Stratospheric Vortex 2002, as observed with the Michelson Interferometer for Passive Atmospheric Sounding (MIPAS)

03 | ACP, 12 Mar 2009:
Comparison of tropospheric gas-phase chemistry schemes for use within global models