

1 **Response to referee comments on “Spatial distribution and temporal trend of ozone pollution**
2 **in China observed with the OMI satellite instrument, 2005–2017”**

3
4 We thank the referees for their careful reading of the manuscript and the valuable comments. This
5 document is organized as follows: the Referee’s comments are in *italic*, our responses are in plain
6 text, and all the revisions in the manuscript are shown in blue. The line numbers in this document
7 refer to the updated manuscript.
8
9

10 **Referee #2**

11
12 *This is a nice study that explores the potential of OMI observations of tropospheric ozone to detect*
13 *the ozone pollution over China. While it’s unrealistic to use OMI data to capture the day-to-day*
14 *variability of ozone pollution, the authors show extreme ozone pollution may be detectable by*
15 *aggregating long-term observations using statistical methods. Overall I think this is an important*
16 *study to the field, which opens up the possibility to use satellite observations to detect surface ozone*
17 *pollution, but I think the authors overpromise the value of satellite data. I have several major*
18 *concerns:*

19
20 **Response.** Thanks for raising these good points. This feedback has significantly improved the
21 manuscript. Now we have a new Figure 4 showing that OMI 850-400 retrievals have limited skill in
22 predicting the daily ozone variability in the north and we only predict the trends of ozone pollution in
23 southern China (south of 34°N). We have new in-situ observations to validate the trends inferred
24 from the OMI, which are shown in Figure 6.

25
26 1. *My major concern is that the authors seem to overpromise the value of OMI data for*
27 *characterizing the spatial and temporal trend of ground-level ozone. The title and the abstract leave*
28 *me an impression that OMI satellite data can capture the spatial distribution and the long-term trend*
29 *in ground-level ozone, but the results only suggest OMI may be able to detect high ozone pollution*
30 *and capture the large-scale or latitudinal variations. I suggest the authors consider revising the title,*
31 *otherwise it’d be misleading to readers. The authors need to be more careful with the wording. I*
32 *think this work would actually be much more valuable if the authors can clarify the limitations of*
33 *OMI data, which will also be useful for preparation of next-generation satellites.*

34 **Response.** Thanks for making such a good point. Now we revised the title and also discussed the
35 limitations in many parts of the main text.

36 **New title.** Ability of the OMI satellite instrument to observe surface ozone pollution in China:
37 application to 2005-2017 ozone trends

38 P1 L18. OMI is much more successful at capturing the day-to-day variability of surface ozone at sites in
39 southern China (<34°N ($R = 0.3-0.6$) than in northern China ($R = 0.1-0.3$) because of weaker retrieval
40 sensitivity and larger upper tropospheric variability in the north.

41 P5 L7. This implies that OMI can only provide statistical rather than deterministic temporal information on
42 ozone pollution episodes, and may be more useful in South than in North China. We return to this point in
43 Section 4.

44 P5 L18. The correlation of OMI with the MEE surface ozone data likely does not reflect a direct sensitivity of

45 OMI to surface ozone, which is very weak, but rather a sensitivity to boundary layer ozone extending up to a
 46 certain depth and correlated with surface ozone.


47 P6L27. We find that the low correlation of OMI with boundary layer ozone in the northern ozonesonde data is
 48 due not only to the low DOFS but also to a large variability of ozone in the upper troposphere. Figure 4 (left
 49 panel) shows the standard deviation of daily OMI 400-200 hPa ozone during 2005-2017 summers, indicating
 50 that upper tropospheric ozone has much higher variability in the north ($> 34^{\circ}\text{N}$) than in the south. This is
 51 related to the location of the jet stream and more active stratospheric influence (Hayashida et al., 2015). Figure
 52 4 (right panel) displays the vertical profiles of ozone standard deviations for the five ozonesonde sites. For the
 53 two sites north of 34°N , the ozone variability becomes very large above 8 km. Since the OMI 850-400 hPa
 54 retrieval also contains information from above 400 hPa, this upper tropospheric variability causes a large
 55 amount of noise that masks the signal from boundary layer variability. For the three sites south of 34°N , the
 56 ozone variability in the boundary layer is much higher than in the free troposphere and the upper tropospheric
 57 ozone variability still remains low even above 8 km. In the rest of this paper we focus our attention on ozone
 58 episodes and the long-term trends in southern China (south of 34°N).

59
 60 2. Is the point process model you used to predict ozone exceedance probability site specific? If so,
 61 how can you apply this method widely to areas without ground-based sites (as you promised in the
 62 conclusion)? The authors present the surface ozone pollution and exceedance probability only at
 63 ground-based sites, but why not show the distribution across China? For example, MEE network
 64 mainly consists of urban sites. Can you use OMI data to tell the spatial patterns of ozone pollution
 65 over rural/remote areas? If not, what's the added value of OMI data to existing ground-based
 66 network?

67 **Response.** Thanks. The point process model makes use of all the data. Now we show the trends of
 68 ozone for all rural and remote regions in south China.

69 P7 L14. We fit the model to all daily concurrent observations of surface ozone and OMI ozone enhancements
 70 for the ensemble of eastern China sites in Figure 1 (90,601 observations for summers 2013-2017).

Changes in summertime surface ozone pollution inferred from OMI (2005-2009 to 2013-2017)



71
 72 **Figure 6.** Changes in surface ozone pollution in China between 2005-2009 and 2013-2017 as
 73 inferred from OMI afternoon observations at around 13:30 local time. (a) Change in mean summer
 74 afternoon concentrations, obtained from the difference in the mean OMI enhancements at 850-400

75 hPa and applying equation (1). Also shown with symbols are observed changes in mean MDA8
76 ozone from in situ observations in Lin'an, Hong Kong, and Taiwan reported by TOAR (Schultz et
77 al., 2018). Because the TOAR observations are only reported for 2005-2014, we estimate the
78 changes from 2005-2009 to 2013-2017 on the basis of the reported linear trends during 2005-2014
79 (ppb a^{-1}). The change of 12-15 LT ozone at the Hok Tsui station in Hong Kong is 5.8 ppb. (b)
80 Change in the number of high-ozone days (> 82 ppb) per summer, calculated by applying the
81 probability of exceeding 82 ppb (equation 8) to the daily OMI enhancements. Also shown with
82 symbols are observed changes of the number of days with MDA8 ozone exceeding 80 ppb at the
83 TOAR sites, similarly adjusted as the change from 2005-2009 to 2013-2017. The change in the
84 number of days with 12-15 LT ozone exceeding 82 ppbv at the Hok Tsui station in Hong Kong is
85 2.1 days.

86
87 *3. Figure 5: While OMI data may be able to detect the sign of the change in ground- level ozone, the*
88 *magnitude of the change is less convincing to me. The authors suggest a 0.67 ppb /year increase in*
89 *mean ozone over China, which seems to be lower than previous studies. The point process model is*
90 *trained with ground-based observations in 2013-2017, but it's unknown how the model performs for*
91 *early years 2005 - 2009. I'd suggest the authors use available long-term ground-based ozone*
92 *observations to verify the long-term change. I understand long-term ground-based observations are*
93 *not generally available over China, but since the OMI data are global, it's possible to extend the*
94 *analysis to wider regions (e.g. Hong Kong, Japan) where long-term sites are available for*
95 *evaluation.*

96 **Response.** Thanks. We have new in-situ observations from TOAR and also from a Hong Kong site to
97 validate the trends inferred from the OMI, which are shown in Figure 6. We find the OMI inferred
98 trends are fairly consistent with the long-term records available from surface sites. We also add discussion
99 in the main text.

100 P4 L11. For evaluating the long-term surface ozone trends inferred from OMI, we use 2005-2014 trend
101 statistics for maximum daily 8-hour average (MDA8) ozone from the Tropospheric Ozone Assessment Report
102 (TOAR) (Schultz et al., 2018). We also have 2005-2017 JJA 12-15 LT mean ozone at the Hok Tsui station in
103 Hong Kong (Wang et al., 2009).

104 P9 L5. We compared the OMI trends in Figure 6 to the trends of MDA8 ozone and number of high-ozone days
105 reported by the long-term TOAR sites (Schultz et al., 2018) and our own analysis for the Hok Tsui station in
106 Hong Kong (Wang et al., 2009). For Lin'an, Hong Kong, and the 5 sites in Taiwan, the changes of mean
107 ozone concentrations from 2005-2009 to 2013-2017 are 1.1, 2.3, and -0.18 ± 2.2 ppbv (standard deviation
108 among the 5 sites) as estimated from OMI, compared to 0.7, 5.6 (or 5.8 in Hok Tsui station), and -0.75 ± 3.4
109 ppbv for MDA8 ozone at the TOAR sites. The changes in the number of ozone episodes per summer are 1.2,
110 1.9, and -0.17 ± 0.74 days in OMI, compared to 2.1, 1.8 (or 2.1 in Hok Tsui station), and -3.5 ± 3.9 days at the
111 TOAR sites. These OMI inferred trends are fairly consistent with the long-term records available from surface
112 sites.

113