

Interactive comment on “A new top boundary condition for modeling surface diffusive exchange of a generic volatile tracer: theoretical analysis and application to soil evaporation” by J. Y. Tang and W. J. Riley

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 1 February 2013

The paper is generally very well written and addresses an important scientific question relevant to the hydrological science community. I believe that the new top boundary condition for exchange of volatile tracers from soil to the atmosphere is a significant improvement over prior formulations. The title clearly represents the content of the paper, and the abstract gives a sufficient summary of the paper. The mathematical derivations appear to be correct. I was somewhat confused on the physical meaning of some of the parameters in the derivations. I think that an additional table defining

C6569

all the symbols including the units used would be of benefit to the reader. The evaluation of the new top boundary condition and comparison to earlier formulations and empirical results was well done and presented. I think that the conclusions reached are appropriate based on the extensive evaluation and comparisons. References are sufficient.

An additional complicating transport mechanism not considered in this paper that may be significant in the exchange of VOC and pesticide vapors with the soil and the atmosphere is the very large adsorption of these vapors on very dry soil. This is not particularly an issue with water but could be important as the authors move on to other vapors. When the soil surface becomes very dry with only a few molecular layers of adsorbed water, the adsorption of VOC and pesticide vapors on the dry soil increases by orders of magnitude. This effect has been observed in both field and lab experiments.

Some editorial and other suggestions follow:

Page 11942, line 21. Data are plural. Thus, “is” should be replaced with “are”. P 11945, l 11. Define beta here. I did not realize until much later in the paper that beta is simply the ratio of evaporation to potential evaporation. In my opinion, “evaporation efficiency” is not a very descriptive term. Why not use “relative evaporation”? P 11947, l 9. This curve is generally called the “soil-water characteristic” or “soil-water retention” curve. P 11949, l 15. Symbol C_{ga} is not consistent with C_a in Fig. 1. P 11949, l 18. Explain where the “2” comes from in Eqns (5) and (6). I assume that this comes about because concentrations and other variables are defined at the center of the top soil control volume, but this is not clear. P 11954, Eqn (15). Again beta is not adequately defined. P 11957, l 10. “complicated” rather than “complicate”. P 11957, l 18. remove “the”. P 11958, l 21. Rephrase sentence. How can there be an interaction between an atmospheric conditions and soil physics? P 11959, l 3. “what” instead of “that”? P 11959, l 14-15. Fig 2a seems to be just as good an agreement. P 11960, l 11. Describe the characteristics of the curves that show two-stage evaporation behavior. P 11960, l 13-14. It is not clear to me that this statement is justified by the curve in Fig.

C6570

3c. P 11961, l 10. LP92? P 11961, l 27-28. This statement is not apparent from the figure. P 11964, l 25-26. This is the first place that I understood the physical meaning of beta. P 11968, l 12-19. These statements are not clear to me from what is presented in the figure. P 11991. Fig 2. The red line for the curve captions is missing. P 11992, Fig 3. For anyone that is "color challenged", it is difficult to easily see the differences between some of the colors. I suggest using broken and dot-dash lines for some of the curves and in the other figures. P 11993, Fig. 4. $r_{\text{sub } a}$ rather than $g_{\text{sub } a}$ in caption?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 11941, 2012.

C6571