Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/amt-2018-192-AC1, 2018
© Author(s) 2018. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Preparation of primary standard mixtures for atmospheric oxygen measurements with uncertainty less than 1 ppm for oxygen mole fractions" *by* Nobuyuki Aoki et al.

Nobuyuki Aoki et al.

aoki-nobu@aist.go.jp

Received and published: 16 November 2018

We wish to express our appreciation for your significant and useful comments. We have revised the manuscript, considering your comments and suggestions.

Referee #1 Received and published: 24 July 2018 This paper presents an improved method for preparing gravitational mixtures of O2, N2, Ar, and CO2 in air, with potential importance for a range of atmospheric measurements, particularly for detection of long-term trends in O2/N2 ratio. I sense the basic gravitational work was done with great care. But the presentation itself is not polished, and I had difïňĄculty following some of the methods and discussions, such as the comparisons with natural air. The

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

presentation is sufïňĄciently unclear that it will be of limited value in documenting the method and results. There is also at least one outstanding analytical issue that may need to be addressed with further lab work. I recommend resubmission after major revision, although with the large number of substantive issues, this would be equivalent to withdrawing and resubmitting.

General concerns: I can't follow the method by which the absolute mole ratios in the reference (natural) air cylinder CR00045 were assessed based on comparison the standards. This is not well explained, and seems possibly problematic. I speciïňĄcally missed clariïňĄcation that the mass spectrometer used to measured (O2/N2) and d(Ar/N2) in fact measures the dominant isotopologue ratio 16O2/14N2 and Ar/14N2. Thus it should be sufïňĄcient to know the absolute 16O2/14N2 and Ar/14N2 ratios in the gravimetric standards to assess the absolute 16O2/14N2 and Ar/14N2 of CR00045 through the delta measurements. From the absolute 16O2/14N2 and Ar/14N2 ratios in CR00045, one could determine the absolute O2/N2 and Ar/N2 ratios including all isotopologues in CR00045 simply by knowing the isotopic abundances in natural air. Eqs (3) and (4), which I assume are being used in this comparison, look incorrect because they include irrelevant information on the isotopic abundances of the standard mixture. Could the authors perhaps have made the incorrect assumption that the mass spectrometer actually measures the delta based on the sum of all isotopologues? Response: The absolute values which were precisely determined by the gravimetric method were the (O2/N2) and (Ar/N2) ratios not the (16O2/14N2) and (40Ar/14N2) ratios. Additionally, if the absolute (O2/N2) is calculated based on the (16O2/14N2), its uncertainty is larger than the gravimetrically calculated uncertainty. Therefore, we discussed the d(O2/N2) and d(Ar/N2) ratios based on the absolute (O2/N2) and (Ar/N2) ratios not isotopologue ratios 16O2/14N2 and 40Ar/14N2. We revised the sentence to be easy to be understood.(section 2.4.1, 5.1)

The paper overlooks the possibility that the concentrations delivered from the tanks for analysis might differ from gravimetric ratios by either homogeneous or inhomogeneous

CC BY

fractionation. Numerous previous studies (e.g. Leuenberger et al., AMT 2015; Langenfelds et al, 2005, JGR -Atmospheres 110(D13); Keeling et al, JGR 1998; Keeling et al Tellus B 2004) have drawn attention to these issues, which often dominate errors and therefore cannot be ignored. As shown by both the Keeling and Leuenberger studies, a pertinent measurement is to assess the change in composition of the tank as it is depleted. This effectively is a constraint on both types of fractionation. Surface adsorption/fractionation at lower pressure ranges could be assessed by ïňĄlling an evacuated tank up to modest pressure (e.g. 3 atmospheres) and looking at composition anomalies in the residual gas caused by the ïňĄlling. Tests of this sort could be done with similar tanks ïňĄlled with natural air, sparing the gravimetric tanks. Perhaps the authors have other ideas. In any case, some additional lab work is needed to assess these effects, which cannot realistically be assessed theoretically. Another omission is a discussion of the interferences from gases other than O2/N2, Ar, and CO2 on the mass spectrometer measurement. Ne, He, Kr, CH4, H2, and N2O all have abundances over 0.1 ppm in air, but presumably not in the gravimetric tanks. The effects may be small but need evaluation or discussion. Response: we used the same type of the cylinders which Tohjima et al. had used. Since they had already verified the change of the concentrations delivered from the tanks for analysis, we didn't perform this verification. However, because we didn't discuss the verification in this paper, we add the sentences about their verification (P13, L14−L18). We carried out an additional experiment for the interferences from Ne and added the result in the paper (P12, L17−L22), since the molar fraction of Ne is highest in the minor components.

It's unclear what was learned from the paramagnetic measurements that compare gravimetric standards to a tank of synthetic air. Also, the discussion of the paramagnetic measurements lacks a discussion of interferences. I suggest that this content be cut, as it doesn't appear to address anything important. Response: We removed this content according to your comment

The study lacks a direct comparison with the previous gravimetric work of Tohjima et

CC BY

al (2005). Section 6.1 is entitled “Comparison between O2/N2 ratios on the AIST and NIES scales”, but in stead of reporting such a comparison,e.g. by exchanging cylinders with NIES, this section does something else entirely: They use their measurements to report a trend in O2/N2 by combining the previous absolute estimate of O2 mole fraction at Hateruma station in Tohjima et al, with a new absolute determination at Hateruma done by the authors 15 years later. The inferred trend in O2/N2 at Hateruma is shown to be signiïňĄcantly smaller than the trend measured at La Jolla over the same period by the Scripps group. But before they make this very speculative comparison, they ïňĄrst need to carry out a direct comparison of standards. Also, I believe that the NIES group has made measurements over the full time frame at Hateruma. Surely, the NIES data should be examined before comparing with La Jolla. Other points: Page 2, line 21. The context of the 500 per meg ïňĄgure is unclear. I assume it may reïňĆect the decrease over some time period of measurement, but this isn’t clear nor is the reason for this statement. Response: We revised to the comparison between the O2/N2 ratios at Hateruma in 2015 determined by AIST and by NIES. Now, a direct comparison between NIES scale and AIST scale using gravimetric standard gases is being performed. In other paper, we will present detail of the results (section 6.1).

Page 2, lines 21-31. This paragraph is intended to provide motivation, but I found it hard to follow. It also misses important content. I suggest this prose be replaced with a summary of current practice of calibrating O2/N2 measurements and explaining why the development of absolute standards would satisfy an important need by overcoming the reliance on the long-term stability of O2/N2 ratios in high pressure aluminum gas cylinders. Here might also be a good place to mention the relevance of homogenous and heterogeneous fractionation mechanisms and the relevance of good practice in withdrawing air from tanks. Response: We revised to explaining why the development of absolute standards would satisfy an important need by overcoming the reliance on the long-term stability of O2/N2 ratios in high pressure aluminum gas cylinders in accordance with your comments (P2, L20−P3, L9)

CC BY

Page 3, line 30. Punctuation problem. “as such” is start of new sentence. Response: We revised the sentence (P4, L25). Page 3, line 31. Meaning of “calibration lines” is unclear to me. Response: We revised the sentence from “calibration lines” to “the relation between the outputs of mass comparators and the masses of artifacts”.

Section 2.3.2. This section lacks adequate motivation. Why is it relevant to measure the O2/N2 and Ar/N2 ratios of the gravimetric mixtures when their ratios are known from the gravimetric preparation? I think the context here is a comparison with natural air. Another title for this section and few sentences of explanation are needed. Response: We add the motivation in section 2.4.1 (p5, L26-L27)

Page 5, line 11. I can’t follow, as the distinction between sample and standard is unclear here. Is CRC0045 the sample or the standard? Note that the delta value for CRC00045 will be zero by deïňĄnition. This is true whether the delta value is based on the dominant isotopes or not. This content therefore makes no sense to me. Response: CRC0045 is used as the reference air not sample air. The section 2.3 were revised overall (moving from the section 2.3 to the section 2.4).

Page 5, line 14 and Eq. (3) and (4). In the context of this section, it is unclear what is meant by δ(O2/N2)and δ(Ar/N2) without isotopic label. Does this refer to a ratioformed based on the sum of all isotopologues? Page 5, Eq. (3) and (4). Why do 18O17O, 18O18O, 15N15N not appear in these equations? Page 5, line 25. It would be good here to repeat that the label “standard” refers to CRC00045. Response: The section 2.3 were revised overall (moving from the section 2.3 to the section 2.4).

Section 2.3.3. Similar to the last section, the section title seems wrong and motivation is lacking. It’s especially confusing that a comparison to synthetic air is being done. How was the value of 20.650% determined? Since the uncertainty on 20.650% is much greater than the uncertainty on the gravimetric mixtures, it’s hard to see the point of this comparison. As discussed above, I suggest cutting this section. Response: We removed this section.

CC BY

Page 6, lines 25 and 26. Meaning of “work” unclear. Is this meant in a thermodynamic sense? Work versus heat? Generally, this paragraph is hard to follow. Response: We revised the sentences (P7, L14 –L23).

Page 6, lines 32, 33 and 36. Meaning of “equilibrium” is unclear, and is perhaps the wrong word choice. It seems it is deïňĄned operationally by the stability of the readings overtime. I miss a statement about temperature measurements. How was temperature measured? Response: The “equilibrium” mean thermal and water adsorption equilibrium for the surface of the sample cylinder (P7, L25). We add the statement about temperature measurements according to your comments (P4, L34 –L36)

Page7,line16-17. “The mass difference decreases...”Unclear that this is a statement about the sign, as it reads more as a statement about magnitude, e.g. would the difference be smallest with a very large temperature difference? Would be clearer if stated as “warmer cylinders appear lighter (or heavier?)”. Even on multiple readings I can’t ïňĄgure out which direction is implied. Response: We add the sentence according to your comments (P8, L2 –L3)

Page 7, lines 21-28. The information in this paragraph should be condensed and merged with the previous paragraph. It would be easier to follow the earlier paragraph if the temperature measurements were discussed BEFORE discussing the impact on weighings. Response: We merged this paragraph and the previous paragraph and discuss the temperature measurements before discussing the impact on weighing (P7, L31–P8, L3)

Page 6-7, I urge that Sections 3.1 and 3.2 be merged into one section to improve readability. I note that there is no discussion of how the surface temperature of the cylinders was measured. Okay, reading further, I see it is eventually discussed. Maybe this should be mentioned above in Materials and Methods, where more detail could be given, e.g. how was thermocouple attached? Was it left in place during weighings? Response: Section 3 was revised overall. The method to measure the cylinder’s

CC BY

temperature was mentioned in Materials and Methods.

Page 8, line 25. “humidity and temperature factors”. If the point is that the effect is due to temperature alone, why does this sentence mention temperature factors. Response: We mistakes the sentence. Thermal effect is due to temperature difference alone. The sentence were revised (P9, L2 –L3) .

Page11. The leak-uprate of 0.013mg/day is more than two orders of magnitude faster than the upper bound reported in Keeling et al Tellus B, 59, 2007 for a presumably similar valve at cylinder pressure. The rate is admittedly small in the context of their application, but perhaps not in other applications, so their ïňĄndings may raise concerns. They should at least cite Keeling et al and mention that the rate appears high compared to other work. Response: The leak rate we measured was calculated from monitoring mass of leakage gas. The value reported by Keeling et al. is the change rate of O2/N2 ratio. Both value cannot be compared.

Page 8, line 28. Section 4. The header needs rewording. Suggest “Gravimetric Error Propagation” Response: The header replaced from “preparation of the O2 standard mixtures” to “Evaluation of uncertainty factors for the O2 standard mixtures”.

Page 12, line 3 “Table 5 shows...” Aside from the major question I raised above about the overall logic of this calculation, I miss how the value of (16O2/14N2) standard and (40Ar/14N2) standard are assigned. Response: We explained above about this.

Page 12, line 37 “The d(O2/N2) values obtained were 0.16%...” I can’t follow this sentence. Response: We revised the sentence to easily understand it (P13, L5-L7).

Page 13, lines 4-10. This looks like important information, but I can’t follow. I guess this reïňĆects my difïňĄculty understanding the overall logic of their approach. Page 13, line 17-18, “Using these samples...”. I can’t follow. The sentence appears to assume that the atmospheric O2/N2 ratio is constant. What time of year? Are these annual mean values? Response: We revised the sentence overall to easily understand the

CC BY

overall logic (P13, L7–L13).

Page 13, line 25. This paragraph is hard to follow. The need for Ar corrections is not explained. Wouldn't it be possible to work directly from O2/N2 measurements reported by the NIES group, who have taken care of this detail themselves? As mentioned previously, it's strange here not to directly compare gravimetric standards, so this section as a whole is problematic. Response: The section 6.1 was revised overall. Our value was compared with annual average in 2015 reported by the NIES group.

Page 14, line 1-5. As mentioned in Keeling et al (JGR, 1998), the Scripps scale factor has in fact been compared to gravimetric standards. Response: We removed the Scripps data.

Section6.2. I can't follow why this information is being presented and how it differs from material in the previous section. For example, between this and the previous section, two inconsistent values (0.2680761 and 0.2680701) for the O2/N2 ratio at Hateruma are reported for 2015. Confusing. Response: We cannot completely verify the absolute values in the highly precise O2 standard mixtures (HPO), because there is no standard mixture with uncertainty to be able to verify the HPOs. A method unlike the method performed in the section 5 is considered to be necessary. Additionally, we think that the validation of absolute values is scientifically important to enable the comparison with a previous study, for example, O2 molar fraction (0.20946) determined by Machta and Hughes(1970), etc. We revised in consistent values according to your comments.

Page14, line25. "From 2000 to 2015, it was noted..."The basis for this estimate is not clear. Also, to report O2 changes in ppm risks causing confusion unless some context is given. Does this mole fraction basis include CO2? How does this estimate compare to one based on combining information on the change in O2/N2 with known changes in CO2 abundance? Response: We removed the sentence.

Page 15, line 15. See early comment about this reported rate. Needs context to avoid misunderstanding. Response: We removed the sentence.

CC BY

Figure 1. It's unclear why these curves converge to zero. If the data shown is the change relative to the last point, this should be explained in the caption. Response: We explained the point in the caption.

Figure 4. Unclear which curve goes with which axis. Response: We revised Figure 4.

Figure 5a. The x axis is labeled O2/N2, but could it actually be showing both O2/N2 and Ar/N2? Response: We revised Figure 5.

Table 2. This table is garbled. Some cells and some column headers appear to have in appropriate line breaks. The rows don't line upproperly and the +/- symbols are often not located properly. Response: We revised Table 2.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2018-192, 2018.

CC BY