

Response to comments of Reviewer-2

General comment-1: Girach et al. analyze surface ozone measurements at the Indian East Antarctic Bharati station in comparison with simulations from the chemistry climate model EMAC. The model is used to discriminate the role of subsidence from the stratosphere versus photochemical production in the troposphere or at surface level.

My main criticism is that the model description is not clear enough if or how chemical processes at the snow surface are included, in particular NO_x emissions from the snow pack halogen/bromine chemistry, and the dry deposition of ozone. Even if it is argued that these processes may not be relevant for this particular study, at least it should be made clearer in Section 2.2 which chemical processes are considered by the present EMAC simulations. Relevant EMAC sub-models seem to be available for polar bromine chemistry (Falk and Sinnhuber, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-1115-2018>) and this latter study also investigated the uncertainty in ozone dry deposition velocities (as did other studies).

Response: We thank the referee for the valuable comments. We have incorporated snow-air interaction in the new simulation and revised all the figures. We have now provided better description of the model including chemical processes at the snow surface. Following description is added in the section 2.

Lines 193–200: The model includes emissions of bromine from sea spray following the approach of Kerkweg et al. (2008), and important heterogeneous reactions involving bromine (e.g., liquid phase reactions of HOBr + HBr → Br₂ + H₂O) are included via the AERCHEM subroutines (Rosanka et al., 2023) in the GmXe submodel (Pringle et al., 2010). With the ONLEM submodel, the air-snow subroutine are activated (Falk and Sinnhuber, 2018), which include the bromine release on sea-ice and snow-covered surface, based on the scheme of Toyota et al. (2011). Beside the bromine release, no NO_x release is included by the deposition of O₃. Note that NO_x and HONO emissions from snowpack (Honrath et al., 2002; Bond et al., 2023) are not incorporated in the model.

General comment-2: Overall the manuscript is well written and will be an interesting contribution to the literature, investigating the processes that contribute to ozone variability and trends in a data sparse region. I recommend publication in *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* after the following comments are taken into account.

Response: We thank the reviewer for constructive comments, which have helped us to improve the manuscript significantly. The manuscript has been revised by addressing all the comments. Point-by-point responses to the comments are given below in blue fonts. The discussion added/updated in the manuscript is presented by red text.

Specific comments:

Comment-1: I.217: The statement on the tropopause fold occurrence frequency is somewhat disconnected and it is not clear how the conclusion can be made that the stratosphere to troposphere ozone flux is dominated by tropopause folds in contrast to slow subsidence through the tropopause.

Response 1: Contribution of stratospheric ozone at surface is combined effect of tropopause folds as well as slow subsidence through tropopause and not distinguishable here. Therefore, it cannot be

concluded from the present study that stratosphere to troposphere ozone flux is dominated by tropopause folds. We have briefly mentioned this in the revised manuscript.

Lines 230–233: In addition, gradual subsidence through the tropopause can also contribute to stratospheric ozone transport into the troposphere.

Comment-2: I.250: O_{3s} and O_{3t} are correlated “due to mixing during the transport from the tropopause”. This statement confuses me. So does that mean O_{3s} and O_{3t} do not really represent the stratospheric and tropospheric contributions any more, but rather a mixture of the two? How useful are they then as a diagnostic??

Response 2: Despite they show good correlation, O_{3s} and O_{3t} quantify the stratospheric/tropospheric contributions. Atmospheric dynamical processes do not influence selectively only O_{3s} or O_{3t} as basically they are identical molecules. Therefore, they can mix in the troposphere and they can exhibit strong correlation mainly due to dynamical processes. When there is fresh production or direct influence of stratospheric intrusion, correlation would break/decline over the duration of production/intrusion. Therefore, they are good diagnostics not only for quantifying the stratospheric/tropospheric contribution but also to identify direct or immediate influence of tropospheric production or stratospheric intrusion.

Comment-3: I.252: “Strong local O₃ production (e.g., through NO_x from snow)": again, is O₃ production through NO_x from snow included in the EMAC simulations? If not, is this some kind of circular reasoning? If it is included, would be good to give a few more details.

Response 3: As the referee correctly pointed out, no NO_x emissions is included in the model. However, no significant change is seen in the result. We have revised the sentence.

Line 264: Direct transport of stratospheric air or local production of O₃ would decrease the correlation.

Comment-4: I.285: “to further improve the model in future studies": how? Can you give some hints what may need to be improved?

Response 4: As the referee correctly pointed out, not all necessary air-snow interactions have been included in the model. One example is the NO_x and HONO emissions, which are results of nitrate photolysis within the snowpack (Honrath et al. 2002, Bond et al. 2023).

Comment-5: Fig. 6b/c: The modelled net chemical tendencies (up to around 15 pmol/mol/h) are 1 order of magnitude smaller than the mean observed O₃ tendencies (on average around 0.2 nmol/mol/h during morning and noon). Are the observed O₃ tendencies in 6c not statistically significant? Or are there removal processes missing?

Response 5: Tendencies shown in Figure 6b are purely due to chemistry (net chemical production or loss). Whereas in figure 6c, it is from the observations which includes changes in ozone due to transport (horizontal and vertical) as well as deposition losses. Therefore, large difference is expected. The aim of showing these two together is that negative tendencies in the observed ozone during noontime is in line with chemical losses. Amplitude of mean tendency shown in figure 6c is 0.3 which is comparable to variability at any given hour of the day. Therefore, diurnal patterns on different days may slightly differ from the mean picture shown in figure 6c.

We have revised the text for better clarity as follows.

Lines 378–382: In situ measured rate of change, dO_3/dt , is negative around 11:00 indicating overall loss which includes the influences of both photochemistry, dynamics and deposition losses. Since amplitude of mean dO_3/dt in figure 6c is $0.3 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$, which is comparable or smaller than variability at any given hour of the day. Therefore, diurnal patterns on different days might vary from the mean picture.

Comment-6: I.423: can you give us some idea what the “other” ozone production includes?

Response 6: Here, in figure 8b (green curve), “other” includes all possible reactions excluding reaction of NO with peroxy radicals (HO_2 , RO_2 , CH_3O_2) through which ozone is produced. This could be also reactions of HO_2 with other peroxy radicals formed after long range transport (e.g. reaction of acetyl peroxy radical with HO_2 : $CH_3CO_3 + HO_2$). Since this is estimated by subtracting three production terms from the total production, we could not get insight about other individual production terms.

Minor comments:

Comment-7: I.65: “increasing trend ($<0.2 \text{ nmol/mol/y}$)”: the number refers to a trend, not a trend increase. So either give some numbers how the trend is increasing or delete the word “increasing” in this context. Moreover, the “ $<$ ” means this is an upper limit for the trend; better give a lower limit if available.

Response 7: We have excluded “increasing” term and provided the range ($0.08\text{--}0.13 \text{ nmol/mol/y}$ over Syowa, Arrival Heights, Neumayer, South Pole) of observed positive trends.

Lines 65–66: A positive trend ($0.08\text{--}0.13 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$ over Syowa, Arrival Heights, Neumayer, and South Pole) in surface O_3 has also been reported from Antarctica.

Comment-8: I.209: I suppose “Summit” is on Greenland? Why is this included here? If Summit should be included, please include lat/lon and/or geographic reference.

Response 8: Yes, it is on Greenland, and was mistakenly included. Now we have removed this in the revised manuscript (Line 218).

Comment-9: Fig.1 Caption: suggest to include explicitly the time period shown

Response 9: It is average over the study period (29 January–13 February 2015, 17 January–24 February 2016, and 11 December 2016–16 February 2017), now mentioned in the figure caption (Lines 238–239).

Comment-10: Fig.2 Caption: suggest to mention that O_3s and O_3t are on a different scale than O_3 . (It took me a while before I realized that, couldn’t make sense of it before)

Response 10: Now we have revised the figure caption by mentioning the different scale for O_3s and O_3t (Lines 246–247).

References:

Bond, A. M. H., Frey, M. M., Kaiser, J., Kleffmann, J., Jones, A. E., and Squires, F. A.: Snowpack nitrate photolysis drives the summertime atmospheric nitrous acid (HONO) budget in coastal Antarctica, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 23, 5533–5550, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-23-5533-2023>, 2023.

Falk, S. and Sinnhuber, B.-M.: Polar boundary layer bromine explosion and ozone depletion events in the chemistry–climate model EMAC v2.52: implementation and evaluation of AirSnow algorithm, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 11, 1115–1131, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-1115-2018>, 2018.

Honrath R.E, Lu Y, Peterson M.C, Dibb J.E, Arsenault M.A, Cullen N.J, Steffen K, Vertical fluxes of NO_x, HONO, and HNO₃ above the snowpack at Summit, Greenland, Atmospheric Environment, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310\(02\)00132-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(02)00132-2), 2002.

Jones, A. E., Anderson, P. S., Begoin, M., Brough, N., Hutterli, M. A., Marshall, G. J., Richter, A., Roscoe, H. K., and Wolff, E. W.: BrO, blizzards, and drivers of polar tropospheric ozone depletion events, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 4639–4652, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-4639-2009>, 2009.

Kerkweg, A., Jöckel, P., Pozzer, A., Tost, H., Sander, R., Schulz, M., Stier, P., Vignati, E., Wilson, J., and Lelieveld, J.: Consistent simulation of bromine chemistry from the marine boundary layer to the stratosphere – Part 1: Model description, sea salt aerosols and pH, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 5899–5917, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-5899-2008>, 2008.

Pringle, K. J., Tost, H., Message, S., Steil, B., Giannadaki, D., Nenes, A., Fountoukis, C., Stier, P., Vignati, E., and Lelieveld, J.: Description and evaluation of GMXe: a new aerosol submodel for global simulations (v1), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 3, 391–412, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-3-391-2010>, 2010.

Rosanka, S., Tost, H., Sander, R., Jöckel, P., Kerkweg, A., and Taraborrelli, D.: How non-equilibrium aerosol chemistry impacts particle acidity: the GMXe AERosol CHEMistry (GMXe–AERCHEM, v1.0) sub-submodel of MESSy, EGUsphere [preprint], <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2023-2587>, 2023.

Toyota, K., McConnell, J. C., Lupu, A., Neary, L., McLinden, C. A., Richter, A., Kwok, R., Semeniuk, K., Kaminski, J. W., Gong, S.-L., Jarosz, J., Chipperfield, M. P., and Sioris, C. E.: Analysis of reactive bromine production and ozone depletion in the Arctic boundary layer using 3-D simulations with GEM-AQ: inference from synoptic-scale patterns, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3949–3979, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-3949-2011>, 2011.