Effects of Scavenging, Entrainment, and Aqueous Chemistry on Peroxides and Formaldehyde in Deep Convective Outflow Over the Central and Southeast United States
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Abstract Deep convective transport of gaseous precursors to ozone (O₃) and aerosols to the upper troposphere is affected by liquid phase and mixed-phase scavenging, entrainment of free tropospheric air and aqueous chemistry. The contributions of these processes are examined using aircraft measurements obtained in storm inflow and outflow during the 2012 Deep Convective Clouds and Chemistry (DC3) experiment combined with high-resolution (dₓ ≤ 3 km) WRF-Chem simulations of a severe storm, an air mass storm, and a mesoscale convective system (MCS). The simulation results for the MCS suggest that formaldehyde (CH₂O) is not retained in ice when cloud water freezes, in agreement with previous studies of the severe storm. By analyzing WRF-Chem trajectories, the effects of scavenging, entrainment, and aqueous chemistry on outflow mixing ratios of CH₂O, methyl hydroperoxide (CH₃OOH), and hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) are quantified. Liquid phase microphysical scavenging was the dominant process reducing CH₂O and H₂O₂ outflow mixing ratios in all three storms. Aqueous chemistry did not significantly affect outflow mixing ratios of all three species. In the severe storm and MCS, the higher than expected reductions in CH₂O and H₂O₂ mixing ratios in the storm cores were primarily due to entrainment of low-background CH₂OOH. In the air mass storm, lower CH₂OOH and H₂O₂ scavenging efficiencies (SEs) than in the MCS were partly due to entrainment of higher background CH₂OOH and H₂O₂. Overestimated rain and hail production in WRF-Chem reduces the confidence in ice retention fraction values determined for the peroxydes and CH₂O.

1. Introduction

Deep convective transport of gaseous precursors to ozone (O₃) and aerosols is an important source of O₃ and aerosol production in the upper troposphere (UT), where O₃ and aerosols affect the radiative forcing (Martini et al., 2011) and downwind air quality (Betts et al., 2002; Gerken et al., 2016). O₃ is produced in the upper troposphere from a suite of photochemical reactions involving hydrogen oxides (HOₓ), nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), and their precursors (primarily volatile organic compounds, VOCs). Due to the short lifetime of HOₓ in the UT, the UT abundance of HOₓ is controlled by the convective transport of HOₓ precursors. HOₓ precursors such as CH₂O, CH₃OOH, and H₂O₂ partition into cloud water and chemically transform, resulting in a fraction of these trace gases being removed by precipitation.
Aircraft observations in thunderstorm inflow and outflow regions during the 2012 Deep Convective Clouds and Chemistry (DC3) campaign enable the examination of convective transport in storms that formed in different dynamic and chemical environments. Fried et al. (2016) calculated CH$_2$O SEs ranging from 41% to 58% for DC3 storms. Barth et al. (2016) determined SEs varying from 79% to 97% for H$_2$O$_2$ and from 12% to 84% for CH$_3$OOH, in contrast to the expected CH$_3$OOH SEs of less than 10% based on aircraft measurements from previous field campaigns (e.g., Snow et al., 2007) and the low solubility of CH$_3$OOH. CH$_3$OOH SEs were lower for storms with more entrainment, and Barth et al. (2016) hypothesized that CH$_3$OOH was being replenished by entrainment of CH$_3$OOH from the free troposphere. In addition, cloud-resolving simulations of a severe storm from DC3 showed that ice retention (the process by which soluble species are retained in ice when cloud drops freeze) may also play a significant role in the removal of CH$_3$OOH (ice retention fraction, $r_f > 0.5$, determined by conducting multiple simulations with different $r_f$ values and identifying the simulation for which SEs agreed with those calculated from observations), but not of CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$ ($r_f < 0.25$) (Barth et al., 2016; Bela et al., 2016; Fried et al., 2016). However, Bela et al. (2016) hypothesized that the ice retention assumptions could have been compensating for the lack of aqueous chemistry in the model. For example, if gas phase mixing ratios of CH$_2$O decreased due to aqueous oxidation of CH$_2$O by the hydroxyl radical (OH) to produce formic acid (HCOOH), the $r_f$ value used in the simulation could be artificially decreased to remove less CH$_2$O during cloud drop freezing and produce the correct net CH$_2$O transport. In a comparison of seven cloud chemistry box models, CH$_2$O and CH$_3$OOH mixing ratios were substantially lower and H$_2$O$_2$ mixing ratios were significantly higher in cloudy than clear air (Barth et al., 2003). Therefore, in the present study we investigate in greater detail ice retention for CH$_2$O, H$_2$O$_2$, and CH$_3$OOH and analyze in addition to the severe storm two other types of convection observed during DC3.

Theoretical studies have linked ice retention fractions to species solubility and details of the freezing process. Retention fractions for hydrometeor surfaces with temperatures above freezing (wet growth riming) are likely lower (e.g., $r_f(l \rightarrow l) < 0.2$, where $r_f(l \rightarrow l)$ refers to the fraction remaining in the ice core to that in the liquid (Michael & Stuart, 2009)) than for below freezing hydrometeor surfaces (dry growth riming) because in wet growth riming, species are preferentially expelled from the frozen portion of the hydrometeor interior into the quasi-liquid surface layer. Dry growth riming ice retention fractions have been measured in laboratory and field experiments (e.g., $r_f = 0.05–1.0$ for H$_2$O$_2$, Jost et al., 2017; Iribarne & Pyshnov, 1990; Snider et al., 1992; Snider & Huang, 1998; Voisin et al., 2000; von Blohn et al., 2011, 2013). Ice retention of species that dissociate or react in cloud water can be affected by the reaction kinetics. For example, Jost et al. (2017) determined an average $r_f$ value (the ratio of the concentration in the rime ice versus the liquid phase concentration in the supercooled cloud droplet prior to riming) of 0.97 for CH$_2$O, which they attribute to the diol (CH$_2$(OH)$_2$) formed by aqueous CH$_2$O not being able to dehydrate before the drop freezes. In the WRF-Chem simulations in this study, diol formation is included in the effective Henry’s law coefficient for CH$_2$O because of the rapid formation of the diol.

Model simulations combined with aircraft measurements can be utilized to determine $r_f$ values that result in simulated gas mixing ratios in convective outflow consistent with observations. While the laboratory studies can report $r_f$ for single processes (e.g., dry-growth riming, Jost et al., 2017), the combined model simulations and aircraft measurements approach encompasses several processes that occur within the storm, including scavenging, entrainment, and chemistry. Thus, differences between the theoretical and laboratory studies with the field observations may be reconciled based on multiple processes affecting the trace gases. For example, using a one-dimensional plume model of tropical deep convection, Mari et al. (2000) showed that H$_2$O$_2$ was enhanced in convective outflow while HNO$_3$ was depleted, because H$_2$O$_2$ was not retained in ice during riming. Salzmann et al. (2007) found that for a highly soluble tracer the sensitivity of the deep convective tracer transport to the retention coefficient depends strongly on the initial profile and that tracers with a source in the free troposphere might be more sensitive to the retention coefficient. Furthermore, UT mixing ratios of highly retained trace gases with sources in the middle and upper troposphere were also sensitive to retention. Sensitivity simulations by Barth et al. (2007) with a 3-D thunderstorm model showed that when species are completely degassed, they are transported to the UT, while those retained in frozen hydrometeors are removed from the UT by snow and hail.

In this paper, we use aircraft and radar observations from DC3 combined with high-resolution Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry (WRF-Chem, Grell et al., 2005; Fast et al., 2006) simulations to gain more insight into how ice retention interacts with other microphysical, dynamical, and chemical processes affecting reductions in mixing ratios of CH$_3$OOH, CH$_2$O, and H$_2$O$_2$. We focus our analysis on storms...
in Oklahoma and Alabama and a mesoscale convective system (MCS) over Arkansas/Missouri/Illinois/Mississippi because these storms have been successfully simulated with WRF-Chem (Bela et al., 2016; Li et al., 2017; Phoenix et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2015); because the three storms differ greatly in updraft velocities, storm intensity, storm size, and other factors; and because we can build upon findings from semiidealized modeling studies (e.g., Barth et al., 2007; Mari et al., 2000; Salzmann et al., 2007) and DC3 (Barth et al., 2016; Bela et al., 2016; Fried et al., 2016).

SEs derived from observations use trace gas mixing ratios in storm inflow and outflow regions plus the entrainment rate. In the WRF-Chem simulations, the amount of scavenging depends on the production rate of rain, snow, and graupel from cloud water and ice (\(\text{rainprod} \)) minus evaporation (\(\text{evapprod} \)) (\(\text{precip}_{\text{new}} \) cm\(^{-3}\) H\(_2\)O cm\(^{-3}\) air) at each model level (\(z\)) during a time step (\(\Delta t\), s):

\[
\text{precip}_{\text{new}}(z) = (\text{rainprod}(z) - \text{evapprod}(z))\Delta t
\]

In addition, the amount of WRF-Chem scavenging depends on the \(r_f\) value, the effective Henry’s law solubility constant (\(H_{\text{eff}}\), mol · L\(^{-1}\) · atm\(^{-1}\)), the gas phase mixing ratio (\(A_g\), ppbv), and \(\text{precip}_{\text{new}}\):

\[
\text{SE} \propto \sum_{z_{\text{CB}}}^{z_{\text{CL}}} r_f H_{\text{eff}}(z) A_g(z) \text{precip}_{\text{new}}(z)
\]

where \(z_{\text{CB}}\) is the cloud base height.

If WRF-Chem is not correctly simulating the amount of precipitation production, an erroneous \(r_f\) could be applied in the simulations to produce the correct amount of mixed-phase scavenging. Therefore, in order to evaluate whether \(r_f\) values determined by comparing SEs calculated from observations and simulations are accurate, we need to evaluate how well WRF-Chem represents the precipitation production. Models with more detailed representations of microphysical scavenging, such as that in Barth et al. (2001) that tracks gas concentrations in individual hydrometeors, could provide additional information on, for example, the vertical redistribution of gases evaporated from falling precipitation. However, such an approach is very computationally intensive. In the present study we investigate what can be learned from a model widely used for research and forecasting. With the simulated storms put into context with the observations, we use tracers in the WRF-Chem simulations to examine the amounts of entrainment along the storm cores in relation to the background vertical profiles of the trace gases. We then use trajectory output from the inflow region to the storm top from WRF-Chem to determine the relative contributions of scavenging, entrainment, and aqueous chemistry to the trace gas mixing ratios.

This study addresses the following science questions: How well does WRF-Chem simulate the production of hydrometeor types involved in wet removal (affecting our confidence in the \(r_f\) values determined from simulations)? How does ice retention affect peroxide and CH\(_2\)O removal in an air mass storm and MCS observed during DC3? How much do scavenging, entrainment, and aqueous chemistry contribute to reductions in mixing ratios of peroxides and CH\(_2\)O, in particular, the higher than expected CH\(_3\)OOH removal? Does contact time (CT) with liquid water vary among storms, and if so, does it affect peroxide and CH\(_2\)O outflow mixing ratios via scavenging and/or aqueous chemistry?

### 2. Methods

#### 2.1. DC3 Case Study Storms

Aircraft and ground-based observations were analyzed and high-resolution simulations (horizontal grid spacing (\(\Delta x\)) = 600 m to 3 km) were performed with WRF-Chem of a severe storm in Oklahoma on 29–30 May 2012, an air mass storm in Alabama on 21 May 2012, and a MCS over Arkansas/Missouri/Illinois/Mississippi on 11–12 June 2012. This study adds to the results from Barth et al. (2016), Fried et al. (2016), and Bela et al. (2016), providing \(r_f\) values determined from simulations of the MCS and an analysis of WRF-Chem trajectories that quantifies the contribution of processes (liquid phase scavenging, ice retention, entrainment, and aqueous chemistry) that affect peroxide and CH\(_2\)O outflow mixing ratios.

The severe storm (Oklahoma, 29–30 May) triggered ahead of a dryline and cold front, in a prestorm environment with high 0–6-km vertical wind shear (19 m/s) and high Convective Available Potential Energy (CAPE) (3,113 J/kg) (Bela et al., 2016). The 29–30 May storm is considered severe due to the high vertical extents of its cores, some of which penetrated the tropopause that was located at 17 km above sea level (asl, NEXRAD data, not shown), column-maximum radar reflectivities exceeding 60 dBZ (Figures 1 and 2), and maximum updraft velocities exceeding 68 m/s (DiGangi et al., 2016). Furthermore, the storm generated an enhanced
Figure 1. Column-maximum radar reflectivity contours (dBZ) at 00:20 UTC on 29 May 2012 from (a) NEXRAD radar and (d) WRF-Chem simulations, at 20:40 UTC on 21 May 2012 from (b) NEXRAD radar and (e) WRF-Chem simulations, and at 23:50 UTC on 11 June 2012 from (c) NEXRAD radar and (f) WRF-Chem simulations. DC-8 inflow (magenta), GV (purple), and DC-8 (red) outflow, and DC-8 background profile (green) sampling flight segments are shown by lines. The NSSL or UAH sounding locations are indicated by black dots. The gray lines indicate the location of the vertical cross sections depicted in Figure 2. The inflow, outflow, and background profile sampling times and altitudes are listed in Table S1 in the supporting information. NEXRAD = Next-Generation Radar; WRF-Chem = Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry; MCS = mesoscale convective system; NSSL = National Severe Storms Laboratory; UAH = University of Alabama in Huntsville.

Fujita scale 1 (EF1) tornado and large hail (Barth et al., 2015). The southernmost cell had multiple-Doppler coverage for a little over 1 hr (DiGangi et al., 2016).

The discrete ordinary (air mass) convective storm (Alabama, 21 May) was initiated by a prefrontal trough and was characterized by low CAPE (∼785 Jkg⁻¹) and weak 0–6 km shear (1.54 m s⁻¹). Storm cores attained 12 km altitude and column-maximum reflectivities exceeded 50 dBZ (Figures 1 and 2). It had good coverage by two dual-polarimetric radar (Mecikalski et al., 2015). However, using the i/n-pentane ratio, Fried et al. (2016) determined that aircraft-sampled outflow was significantly more aged than measured inflow, resulting in lower outflow CH₂O values and hence erroneously high SEs, so we did not determine rₓ values for this storm. However, analysis of this storm was still useful in comparing various measured parameters with those modeled by WRF-Chem.

The DC-8 aircraft sampled the inflow and the Gulfstream V (GV) aircraft sampled the outflow of an MCS over Missouri and Arkansas from 22 to 23 UTC on 11 June 2012. Numerous moderately vigorous convective updraft cores with reflectivities up to 50 dBZ extending up to altitudes of 17 km were arranged in a bow formation with a trailing anvil (Figures 1 and 2). The National Weather Service sounding at Jackson, Mississippi, at 0 UTC on 12 June 2012 showed high CAPE values (2,668 Jkg⁻¹) and 0–6-km wind shear (13 m s⁻¹). Only NEXRAD data are available for the MCS.

2.2. Aircraft Measurements

Chemistry, aerosol, and cloud physics measurements in inflow, outflow, and the background environment of the three storms were obtained by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) DC-8 and the National Science Foundation/National Center for Atmospheric Research (NSF/NCAR) GV. The aircraft instruments are described and the uncertainty parameters of the measurements are given in Bela et al. (2016). Fried et al. (2016) discuss wingtip comparisons of the CH₂O measurements on both airplanes and correct the two instruments to each other in order to calculate CH₂O SEs from the air mass storm and MCS. On the other hand, Barth et al. (2016) note that the instruments used to measure CH₂OOH and H₂O₂ on the DC-8 and GV were not calibrated to each other, and discrepancies were noted in wingtip comparisons. Thus, no peroxide SEs were...
Figure 2. Vertical reflectivity cross sections at the locations shown by the gray lines in Figure 1 at 00:20 UTC on 29 May 2012 from (a) NEXRAD radar and (d) WRF-Chem simulations, at 20:40 UTC on 21 May 2012 from (b) NEXRAD radar and (e) WRF-Chem simulations, and at 23:50 UTC on 11 June 2012 from (c) NEXRAD radar and (f) WRF-Chem simulations. The longitudinal and altitude extents of GV (purple) and DC-8 (red) outflow sampling flight segments are designated by rectangles in both NEXRAD and WRF-Chem panels. NEXRAD = Next-Generation Radar; WRF-Chem = Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry; MCS = mesoscale convective system.

calculated from aircraft measurements by Barth et al. (2016) for the air mass storm and MCS, since for these two storms, inflow was sampled by the DC-8 and outflow measurements were made by the GV. However, we still derive information about peroxides scavenging in these two storms from the WRF-Chem simulations.

2.3. Meteorological Measurements

Radar, precipitation, and sounding data were utilized to compare the dynamical and microphysical properties of the three storms and evaluate these properties in the three storm simulations.

NEXRAD reflectivity (described in Bela et al., 2016) was utilized to delineate storm analysis regions and compute storm 35 dBZ volumes. The simulated precipitation is evaluated with the hourly National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) Stage IV analysis, a 4-km contiguous U. S. (CONUS) grid mosaic of radar and gauge analyses from the regional River Forecast Centers.

Radiosonde sounding data were used to calculate CTs with liquid water and evaluate simulated wind, temperature, and humidity vertical profiles. Sounding data near the severe storm were collected by the National Severe Storms Laboratory (NSSL) Mobile Global Positioning System Advanced Upper-Air Sounding (MGAUS) system (Ziegler, 2013c), and those in the vicinity of the air mass storm were provided by the University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH) Mobile Sounding System. For the MCS, the sounding at Jackson, Mississippi, at 0 UTC on 12 June 2012 was used.

Vertical velocity profiles obtained from dual-Doppler radar analyses were used in order to calculate CTs with liquid water and evaluate simulated vertical velocity profiles. The southwesternmost cell of the Oklahoma storm was observed by the NSSL and University of Oklahoma (OU) NO-XP mobile X-band radar and two Shared Mobile Atmospheric Research and Teaching Radars (SMART-R, Biggerstaff et al., 2005, 2017) from about 23 UTC on 29 May 2012 until 0 UTC on 30 May 2012 (DiGangi et al., 2016), with a gridded radar product horizontal (Δx) and vertical (Δz) grid spacing of 500 m. For the air mass storm, dual-Doppler coverage was provided by the KHTX WSR-88D S-band (λ = 10.71 cm) radar at Hytop, Alabama and the UAH WHNT-TV Advanced...
Radar for Meteorological and Operational Research (ARMOR) C-band ($\lambda = 5.5$ cm) radar at the Huntsville International Airport (Mecikalski et al., 2015; $\Delta x = \Delta z = 1$ km). Because dual-Doppler radar observations were not collected for the MCS storm, we used the maximum updraft velocity profile obtained from the convective cores of a small MCS observed during the Thunderstorm Electrification and Lightning Experiment (TELEX, Lund et al., 2009; MacGorman et al., 2008; $\Delta x = \Delta z = 500$ m). The DC3 11–12 June MCS was somewhat larger than the TELEX MCS. At the end of its maturation period, convective cells forming the TELEX MCS extended in a line of about 300 km in extent, while at the end of the aircraft outflow sampling period, the DC3 11–12 June MCS formed a bow shape ∼550 km in extent. Nevertheless, the TELEX MCS maximum updraft profile is a reasonable approximation for that in the DC3 11–12 June MCS due to their similar severities. Column-maximum reflectivity attained 55 dBZ in the DC3 11–12 June MCS during the outflow sampling period (Figure 1) and 57.5 dBZ at the mature stage of the TELEX MCS (Lund et al., 2009).

### 2.4. Model Description and Configuration

#### 2.4.1. Meteorology and Chemistry Configuration

For each storm, four WRF-Chem simulations were conducted in which CH$_3$OOH, CH$_2$O, H$_2$O$_2$, HNO$_3$, and SO$_2$ were scavenged in cloud and raindrops, but retained in snow and graupel/hail with different $r_f$ values ($r_f = 0$, 0.25, 0.5, and 1.0). The WRF-Chem model configurations for the simulations of the three storms are listed in Tables S2–S4 in the SI. An additional simulation with scavenging was conducted with 0.25, 0.5, and 1.0). The WRF-Chem model configurations for the simulations of the three storms are listed in Tables S2–S4 in the SI. An additional simulation with scavenging was conducted with $r_f$ values varying by species, as defined in Leriche et al. (2013) (CH$_3$OOH and SO$_2$: $r_f = 0.02$, CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$: $r_f = 0.64$, HNO$_3$: $r_f = 1$). Leriche et al. (2013) chose the same $r_f$ value for CH$_2$O as measured in the laboratory for H$_2$O$_2$ by von Blohn et al. (2011), due to the relatively similar solubilities of CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$. Finally, a simulation of each storm was conducted with no gas scavenging. Bela et al. (2016) detail the WRF-Chem simulations of the severe storm and the Neu and Prather (2012) (NP2012) wet scavenging scheme used in simulations of all three cases. The NP2012 scheme calculates gas removal due to microphysical scavenging as the product of the temperature-dependent effective Henry’s law coefficient (given in the SI of Bela et al., 2016) and the net precipitation formation (conversion of cloud water to precipitation minus evaporation). Additionally, for mixed-phase conditions ($258 \, \text{K} < T < 273 \, \text{K})$, a constant fraction ($r_f = \text{retention factor}$) of the amount of each species dissolved in cloud water that is converted to newly formed precipitation is returned to the gas phase. The NP2012 scavenging scheme also represents the deposition of gaseous HNO$_3$ on ice for $T < 258$ K. Kinetic limitations were not taken into account, which may lead to errors in the liquid phase concentrations of CH$_2$O and the peroxides. For example, tracers with solubilities similar to those of CH$_2$O and the peroxides did not attain Henry’s Law equilibrium in a 6-s model time step (Barth et al., 2001), and our severe and air mass storm simulations used a 3-s time step. In our simulations, nor are dissolved gases retained in cloud water from one time step or grid cell to the next, as in Barth et al. (2001). The meteorology and chemistry configurations of the air mass storm and MCS simulations are described by Li et al. (2017). In the present study, we add entrainment tracers to the simulations of the air mass storm and MCS and online chemical trajectories to all three simulations.

For the severe storm simulation, the Morrison two-moment microphysics scheme (Morrison et al., 2009) was used, while the air mass storm and MCS simulations utilized the WRF Single-Moment 6-class microphysics (WSM6, Hong & Lim, 2006) parameterization. We have chosen the microphysics scheme for each storm that produces the most realistic simulation, allowing us to examine the effect of different storm dynamics on the importance of mixed-phase versus liquid scavenging. While Salzmann et al. (2007) found some sensitivity in results depending if there were cloud drops in the inflow region of the storm, we did not find this situation in the cases we simulated. We note that in the Morrison scheme for the severe storm simulation, hail-like properties of mixed-phase hydrometeors were chosen ($e.g., \rho_g = 0.9 \, \text{g/cm}^3$), whereas in the WSM6 microphysics parameterization for the air mass storm and MCS simulations, graupel-like mixed-phase hydrometeor characteristics were utilized ($e.g., \rho_g = 0.5 \, \text{g/cm}^3$). Due to its lower density, we would expect the graupel/hail simulated by the WSM6 microphysics scheme to have a larger diameter and thus fall more rapidly than that in the Morrison scheme. Furthermore, the two schemes have different parameterizations of precipitation formation processes, such as the collection of rain by falling ice (Lin et al., 1983; Morrison et al., 2005). The equations used to calculate the net precipitation production for the Morrison scheme are given in the SI of Bela et al. (2016) and for WSM6 microphysics in Text S1 in the SI of this publication.

The three simulations had horizontal grid spacings ranging from 600 m to 3 km and did not use a convective parameterization. With these grid spacings, entrainment may not be produced sufficiently (Bryan et al., 2003; Bryan & Morrison, 2012). Furthermore, statistical convective properties have been shown not to converge.
until the grid spacing was reduced to 250 m for an idealized squall line (Lebo & Morrison, 2015). However, computational limitations prevented us from further decreasing the horizontal grid spacing for these simulations.

2.4.2. Tracers
To evaluate whether the simulated amount of entrainment along the storm cores was consistent with that calculated from aircraft hydrocarbon measurements by Fried et al. (2016) (n,i-butane, n,i-pentane, and also n-hexane and n-heptane for the severe storm), we created passive tracers for each 1-km layer of atmosphere from the surface to model top (~20 km for the severe storm simulation and ~19 km for the air mass storm and MCS simulations). The tracers were set to a value of 1.0 in clear air outside of the storms (where $q_c < 0.01$ g/kg) for a single time step approximately 1 hr before the end of the outflow periods (listed in the simulation configuration Tables S2–S4 in the SI). To calculate entrainment from each 1-km altitude layer, the average percent contributions of each 1-km layer were calculated from all model points at the 40-dBZ contour (top of storm core) directly upwind of the aircraft sampling location, within the aircraft outflow sampling altitudes (Barth et al., 2016).

2.4.3. Trajectories
For each storm simulation, 864 online trajectories were initialized in storm inflow regions. The initial locations of the trajectories formed a 3-D grid with eight evenly spaced points in longitude and four points in latitude, and nine points at altitudes of 600–3,000 m (vertical grid spacing $\Delta z = 300$ m). Trajectories were initiated at these locations at three starting times evenly spaced within the inflow time period. Only trajectories that were ingested by the simulated storms, as determined by having attained the minimum height of the outflow observations, were analyzed. The trajectory initial longitudes and latitudes, longitude and latitude spacings, and start and stop times are given in Table S5 in the SI. For the trajectory analysis, we did not need to assume constant entrainment with altitude because the resulting mixing ratios come from the Eulerian WRF-Chem model which accounts for the 3-D heterogeneity in mixing processes.

3. Evaluation of Meteorology

3.1. Radar Reflectivities
The observed dynamics of the storms were represented well by the model, including locations and times of convective initiation (except for the severe storm, which triggered ~40 min later in simulations than observed), maximum reflectivity in storm cores, anvil height and horizontal extent, and maximum height of the storm cores (Figures 1 and 2). However, the regions of high reflectivity (>35 dBZ) indicative of storm cores were larger in the model simulations than those observed for all three storms, possibly due to a larger volume containing ice in the simulations than observed and/or differences in the effective reflectivity calculation between the radar and WRF-Chem. Bela et al. (2016) and Li et al. (2017) provide a detailed evaluation of the WRF-Chem meteorology with radar observations.

3.2. Entrainment
The average amount of entrainment per kilometer (%km$^{-1}$) from WRF-Chem (Figure 3) compares well with Fried et al. (2016) who used hydrocarbon trace gases (severe storm, WRF-Chem: 7.8 ± 5.4%km$^{-1}$, Fried et al. (2016): 7.6 ± 1.0%km$^{-1}$; air mass storm, WRF-Chem: 10 ± 9.2%km$^{-1}$, Fried et al. (2016): 8.94 ± 2.7%km$^{-1}$). However, the mean amount of entrainment calculated from WRF-Chem tracers for the MCS (7.3 ± 6.5%km$^{-1}$) is nearly twice as high as that calculated by Fried et al. (2016: 4.4 ± 1.0%km$^{-1}$). For the MCS, we note that the background hydrocarbon profiles used by Fried et al. (2016) were calculated from all clear-air measurements for the entire DC-8 flight, spanning a large geographic area from Kansas to Arkansas, and not necessarily representing the air entrained directly into the MCS. Although this discrepancy in entrainment rate needs further investigation, as we will show later, the average SE determined by Fried et al. (2016) and the WRF-Chem simulations here are in close agreement for the MCS.

3.3. Storm Properties
To learn how much confidence to place in the $r_f$ values determined in this study, we compare observed and simulated maximum vertical velocities, 35 dBZ volumes, hail volumes retrieved from dual-polarimetric radar, hydrometeor fields, and surface precipitation. All of these properties are affected by and provide information about the precipitation production rates in the storm cores, which were not measured.

Observed and simulated storm parameters and precipitation totals were calculated starting at the model output time (10-min output interval) closest to the beginning of the inflow period through the model output time closest to the end of the outflow period. For calculations of storm parameters, spatial masks were...
Figure 3. Fractional contributions of air from 1-km vertical levels calculated from WRF-Chem tracers, background profiles of soluble trace gases calculated from WRF-Chem simulations for (a, b) severe storm, (c, d) air mass storm, and (e, f) MCS, respectively. The numerical fractional contribution values are given in Table S6 in the SI. WRF-Chem = Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry; MCS = mesoscale convective system.

created based on the column-maximum reflectivity fields from NEXRAD and WRF-Chem or on the surface precipitation rates. For the severe storm, the spatial masks were restricted to the southeasternmost convective cell (Kingfisher storm) to facilitate comparison with the radar analyses. For the MCS, the masks were limited to the western portion of the MCS where convective cores lay between the flight tracks of the inflow and outflow observations. No spatial masks were required for the air mass storm as it covered a small area.
Figure 4. Maximum updraft velocities (ms$^{-1}$) calculated from radar (black lines) and WRF-Chem (blue lines) for the (a) severe storm, (b) air mass storm, and (c) MCS. WRF-Chem = Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry; MCS = mesoscale convective system.

and was completely sampled by the radar. The spatial masks for the surface precipitation fields are depicted in Figure S5 in the (SI).

3.3.1. Vertical Velocity

Maximum vertical velocity ($w_{\text{max}}$) time series were determined from dual-Doppler radar analyses for the severe and air mass storms and from the WRF-Chem output for all three storms (Figure 4). For the severe storm, the maximum updraft velocity simulated by WRF-Chem shows relatively good agreement with that retrieved from radar. There is in the radar $w_{\text{max}}$ (45 to 65 ms$^{-1}$) compared to the WRF-Chem $w_{\text{max}}$ (50 to 65 ms$^{-1}$), which may be related to the smoothing effect of the coarser horizontal grid resolution in WRF-Chem ($\Delta x = 1$ km, effective horizontal grid resolution $\sim 5$–7 km due to model numerics (Skamarock, 2004)) versus the radar ($\Delta x = 500$ m). On the other hand, for the air mass storm, simulated maximum updraft velocity is up to 4 times higher than that retrieved from radar (at 20:50 UTC, observed: 5 ms$^{-1}$; simulated: 20 ms$^{-1}$), particularly from 20:30 UTC to 21:20 UTC. The simulated overestimate in updraft velocities is despite the coarser effective resolution in WRF-Chem ($\Delta x = 600$ km, effective horizontal grid resolution $\sim 3$–4 km) versus the radar ($\Delta x = 1$ km). For the severe and air mass storm radar velocity analyses, DiGangi et al. (2016) and Mecikalski et al. (2015) used variational methods to integrate the mass continuity equation. Potvin et al. (2012) found relative root-mean-square errors in updraft velocity retrieved using variational methods ranging from 45% to 90%, depending on the radar scan method and at higher altitudes. Mecikalski et al. (2015) suggested that their retrieved velocities may be underestimated due to integration errors and the 1-km grid spacing.

3.3.2. Hydrometeor Fields

Time series of 35-dBZ volumes (Figure 5) were computed from NEXRAD radar and WRF-Chem simulations within the spatial masks. Hail volumes for the air mass storm and from the WRF-Chem output for all three storms (Figure 5) were obtained from output from the NCAR particle identification (PID) package (Mecikalski et al., 2015). The grouping of the 17 PID classifications into the five WSM6 microphysics classes is given in Table S7 in the SI. The WRF-Chem 35 dBZ volumes are much greater than those calculated from NEXRAD for the entire period for the severe storm (up to more than 2 times larger) and the MCS (up to 7 times larger). For the air mass storm, while the simulations reproduce well the observed 35 dBZ and hail volumes from 19:30 to 20:20 UTC, the simulated 35 dBZ and hail volumes then increase rapidly to more than 5 times larger and 18 times larger than observed, respectively, by 21:20 UTC. The air mass storm and MCS simulations overestimate graupel/hail volume much more than the severe storm simulation, which may be due in part to the use of different microphysics schemes. Due to its lower density, we expect the graupel/hail simulated by the WSM6 microphysics scheme to potentially remain for shorter periods of time within the storms than the graupel/hail simulated by the WSM6 microphysics scheme.

For the severe storm, WRF-Chem hydrometeor mass concentrations (mass per volume) are compared with those from the Diabatic Lagrangian Analysis (DLA) model (Ziegler, 2013a, 2013b; see methods in Text S2 of the SI). Although the DLA is also a microphysical model (Lagrangian versus the Eulerian WRF-Chem), it uses wind and reflectivity fields from dual-Doppler radar analyses and an environmental sounding as input, and thus avoids some of the uncertainties associated with the simulated dynamical and microphysical processes.
Figure 5. The 35-dBZ volumes (m$^3$) calculated from radar (black) and WRF-Chem (blue) for (a) severe storm, (b) MCS, (c) air mass storm, and (d) hail volume (m$^3$) from dual-polarimetric radar (black) and WRF-Chem (blue) for the air mass storm. WRF-Chem = Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry; MCS = mesoscale convective system.

Nevertheless, uncertainty in the DLA hydrometeor fields comes from errors in the radar-retrieved wind fields and the calculation of model reflectivities using simplified backscatter models and parameterized size/shape distributions (Ziegler, 2013b).

In the WRF-Chem severe storm simulation, areas of column-maximum reflectivity >35 dBZ are somewhat larger than those retrieved from the polarimetric radar (Figure S6 in the SI), as noted for the comparison of WRF-Chem with NEXRAD for all three storms (Figure 1).

For the severe storm comparison of WRF-Chem and DLA simulations, we are interested in evaluating the simulated hydrometeor mass concentrations in temperature ranges relevant for microphysical scavenging of the peroxides and CH$_2$O (cloud water between cloud base and 0°C and 0°C and $-15^\circ$C, rain between cloud base and 0°C, cloud ice between cloud base and 0°C and 0°C and $-15^\circ$C, and graupel/hail and snow between 0°C and $-15^\circ$C). Based on the time series of hydrometeor concentrations (Figure 6), severe storm cloud water concentrations are underpredicted and rain and hail are overpredicted by WRF-Chem compared to the DLA results. Thus, WRF-Chem is potentially converting too much cloud water to rain and hail, so that true $r_f$ values may be higher than what we find in this study using WRF-Chem.

We note that the DLA severe storm simulation assumes a variable bulk graupel/hail density that varies with height for mixed-phase precipitation ($\rho_h = 0.63$ to 0.69 g cm$^{-3}$) versus the higher solid ice density assumed in the WRF-Chem simulations of the severe storm ($\rho_h = 0.9$ g cm$^{-3}$). Thus, the DLA graupel/hail is likely to have larger particle diameters and thus fall more rapidly, and therefore would experience a lower riming rate given comparable particle size distributions. Indeed, the highest mass concentrations of graupel/hail in DLA are at lower altitudes (2–5 km asl) than the peak graupel/hail mass concentrations in WRF-Chem (5–15 km asl; Figure S9 in the SI).
Figure 6. Mass concentration (kg m\(^{-3}\)) of (a) cloud water, (b) rain, (c) cloud ice, (d) graupel/hail, and (e) snow for \(w > 3\) m/s regions integrated from cloud base to 0°C (orange-red), and 0°C to −15°C (light blue) from radar/DLA analysis (dots and solid lines) and WRF-Chem simulations (triangles and dashed lines) for the severe storm. For each hydrometeor type, only the mass concentrations integrated for temperature ranges in which the hydrometeor contributes to gas scavenging in the WRF-Chem simulations are shown. DLA = Diabatic Lagrangian Analysis; WRF-Chem = Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry.

3.3.3. Surface Precipitation

The total precipitation volume (Table 1) for the severe storm for the analyzed hour is more than twice as high in the simulations as in the NCEP Stage IV data. However, the precipitation is spread out over a larger surface area in the simulations (Figure S5 in the SI), so that the mean hourly surface precipitation rate is one half in the simulations than in the NCEP Stage IV data. Furthermore, the maximum hourly surface precipitation rate simulated by WRF-Chem is 40% lower than observed.

For the air mass storm, the total surface precipitation volume over the analyzed 3-hr period is about 14% less in the simulations than in the NCEP Stage IV data. The mean hourly surface precipitation rate is 15% higher in the simulations than in the NCEP Stage IV data, and the maximum precipitation rate is 20% higher simulated by WRF-Chem than observed. Although the total surface precipitation volume for the MCS is twice as high in simulations than in observations, the mean hourly surface precipitation rate is only 15% higher in the simulations than in the NCEP Stage IV data, and the maximum hourly surface precipitation rate is only 20% higher simulated by WRF-Chem than observed. Thus, the simulations of the air mass storm and MCS reasonably reproduce the observed surface precipitation rate, and thus potentially the 3-D precipitation production rate, while for the severe storm the mean hourly surface precipitation rate is underestimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm</th>
<th>Time (UTC)</th>
<th>Total (m(^3))</th>
<th>Mean rate (mm hr(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Maximum rate (mm hr(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obs. WRF-Chem</td>
<td>Obs. WRF-Chem</td>
<td>Obs. WRF-Chem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>23–00</td>
<td>(8.60 \times 10^6)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air mass</td>
<td>19–22</td>
<td>(1.69 \times 10^7)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>22–23</td>
<td>(1.56 \times 10^8)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The mean hourly surface precipitation fields for each storm are depicted in Figure S5 in the SI.
in the simulations relative to observations. If the overestimate in the surface precipitation rate indicates that the simulated precipitation production rate inside the storm is too high, the true $r_f$ values would be higher than those found in this study from the WRF-Chem simulations.

4. Ice Retention Fractions Determined Using Simulations and Observations

Values of $r_f$ were determined by identifying the WRF-Chem simulation for which SEs calculated from simulations agree with those calculated from observations. This method assumes that the model is correctly simulating all other parameters in equation (5) (effective Henry’s Law coefficient, gas phase mixing ratio, precipitation production rate), so that the $r_f$ value chosen in the simulation will determine the amount of scavenging. SEs were calculated from the WRF-Chem simulations as the percentage difference in mean outflow values between a simulation with scavenging and the simulation without scavenging:

$$\text{SE}(\%) = 100 \times \frac{q_i \text{noscav} - q_i \text{scav}}{q_i \text{noscav}}$$ (3)

where $q_i \text{noscav}$ and $q_i \text{scav}$ are the mean outflow mixing ratios of species $i$ in the simulation without wet scavenging and a simulation with wet scavenging, respectively. Mean outflow values are calculated from the model latitude-longitude regions depicted in Figures 1d–1f and the altitude ranges sampled by the aircraft (Table S1 in the SI), and $q_i > 0.01$ g kg$^{-1}$. The error analysis is given in Text S3 of the SI. Values of SEs calculated from aircraft observations were determined by Barth et al. (2016) and Fried et al. (2016) using an altitude-dependent entrainment model based on inflow and background mixing ratios and a mean entrainment rate determined from hydrocarbon measurements.

The SEs of CH$_3$OOH, CH$_2$O, and H$_2$O$_2$ calculated from WRF-Chem simulations using different $r_f$ values and the SE ranges calculated from aircraft observations (77 ± 20% for CH$_3$OOH and 88 ± 11% for H$_2$O$_2$, severe storm only, Barth et al., 2016; 54 ± 5% and 48 ± 7% for CH$_2$O for the severe storm and MCS, respectively, Fried et al., 2016) are depicted in Figure 7. We note that the severe storm and MCS simulations use different microphysics schemes (necessary to produce the best simulation of the storm timing, location, size, and intensity), and thus may have different vertical distributions of precipitation production rates. The scavenging scheme in WRF-Chem calculates microphysical removal based on the precipitation production and the temperature range, so that the vertical distribution of precipitation production could affect the amount of scavenging. Nevertheless, we see similar vertical profiles of net precipitation production in the online WRF-Chem trajectories (Figure 8) among the three storm simulations. We did not determine ice retention coefficients from the air mass storm because Fried et al. (2016) showed that the aircraft-sampled inflow and outflow air masses were not related. In addition, the error bars of the SEs calculated from the WRF-Chem simulations of the air mass storm are quite large due to high variability of simulated outflow mixing ratios (Table S9 in the SI), possibly due to large amounts of entrainment in the storm anvil or temporal variability in updraft microphysics or thermodynamics.

The $r_f$ for CH$_2$O in the MCS is <0.25 (Figure 7), in agreement with the results in Bela et al. (2016) for the severe storm. Using the CH$_2$O SE calculated by Fried et al. (2016) using the n-butane ratio method (67 ± 20%), to avoid potential errors from using a horizontally averaged background profile in the altitude-dependent calculation, we still find $r_f < 0.25$ for CH$_2$O. These results conflict with the laboratory measurements of $r_f = 0.97$ for CH$_2$O (Jost et al., 2017). Nevertheless, for the severe storm and MCS, the analysis in the previous section indicates that the simulations are overestimating precipitation production, and thus, the true $r_f$ values may be higher. We also note that the SEs calculated from WRF-Chem simulations used mean outflow values. On the other hand, Fried et al. (2016) extrapolated CH$_2$O mixing ratios from the anvil aircraft sampling location to the top of the storm core to remove the decrease of CH$_2$O with distance from the storm core due to mixing and photochemistry (photolysis and reaction with OH) and also accounted for CH$_2$O production from isoprene and loss by photolysis and reaction with OH in the storm core. Thus, the mean CH$_2$O outflow mixing ratio used to calculate the MCS SE was higher in Fried et al. (2016) (1.52 ppbv) than in this study (1.01 ppbv),
resulting in a lower SE determined by Fried et al. (2016). Still, the MCS CH$_2$O SE calculated using mean outflow aircraft observations and the altitude-dependent method (64 ± 14%) is similar to that from the n-butane method and close to the average SE of 58 ± 13% determined by Fried et al. (2016) for the MCS employing the altitude-dependent and n-butane methods. Furthermore, WRF-Chem SEs calculated using mean mixing ratios at the top of storm core (40 dBZ contour) did not alter the $r_f$ results (Barth et al., 2016; Fried et al., 2016).

Although we do not have SEs calculated from observations for the peroxides, we can still use the simulations to provide information about the role of ice retention in peroxide removal. The simulated CH$_3$OOH SE is highly sensitive to the $r_f$ value for all three storms (Figure 7), suggesting that ice retention is a major process affecting the amount of CH$_3$OOH removal. On the other hand, CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$ SEs are relatively insensitive to the $r_f$ value, especially for the severe storm and MCS, for which simulated SEs for $r_f ≥ 0.25$ are greater than 90% for CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$ and equal to 100% for H$_2$O$_2$ (Figure 7), much higher than the SEs calculated from observations. The larger error bars for the SEs calculated from the model for CH$_3$OOH than for CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$ are due to higher variability in the simulated outflow mixing ratios (Table S9 in the SI). The differing $r_f$ sensitivities suggest that mixed-phase scavenging has a minor impact on CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$ outflow mixing ratios, because sufficient removal of CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$ occurs even with no ice retention. However, as shown in the previous section, the true $r_f$ values may be higher since rain and hail are overpredicted in the severe storm simulation. On the other hand, rain production is likely to be reasonably simulated for the air mass storm and MCS, yet CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging are little affected by $r_f$ for those two storms. In section 5, we analyze the specific processes responsible for these $r_f$ results.

We also calculated SEs for the three storms for HNO$_3$ (41%–54%) and SO$_2$ (85%–95%, Table S10 in the SI), but due to the large uncertainties in HNO$_3$ and SO$_2$ measurements, HNO$_3$ and SO$_2$ scavenging is not analyzed in detail in this paper. Simulated HNO$_3$ SEs (13%–39%, Table S10 in the SI) are not sensitive to $r_f$, suggesting liquid phase scavenging and direct deposition to ice dominate HNO$_3$ removal. Simulated SO$_2$ SEs are sensitive to $r_f$ for the severe storm (SE = 38%–94% for $r_f = 0$–1) and MCS (SE = 53%–97%), but not for the air mass storm (17%–27%), indicating that ice retention may also be an important removal process for SO$_2$. The $r_f$ values from the MCS WRF-Chem simulations with SEs that agree with those calculated from observations for HNO$_3$ and SO$_2$ are given in Table S11 in the SI.

Observed CH$_3$OOH SEs are greater than expected from previous field measurements (Cohan et al., 1999) and from its moderate solubility ($H_{eff}$ at 12°C = 694 Matm$^{-1}$). For the severe storm, the SE for CH$_3$OOH (77%) is higher than that for CH$_2$O (54%), although the effective Henry’s Law coefficient is higher for CH$_2$O (includes formation of CH$_2$(OH)$_2$, $H_{eff}$ at 12°C = 9,580 Matm$^{-1}$). In addition, the CH$_3$OOH severe storm SE is nearly as high as the H$_2$O$_2$ SE (88%), although H$_2$O$_2$ is much more soluble ($H_{eff}$ at 12°C = 258,000 Matm$^{-1}$) than CH$_3$OOH. In the next section, we examine possible reasons for the higher than expected CH$_3$OOH SEs, such as sinks related to aqueous phase chemistry or entrainment.
5. Trajectory Analysis of Processes Potentially Affecting SEs

5.1. Scavenging, Entrainment, and Aqueous Chemistry

We compare the microphysical scavenging, entrainment, and aqueous chemistry sources and sinks of CH$_2$O and the peroxides by calculating the changes in mixing ratios at the top of the mixed-phase region (defined in the model as $\sim$15°C) due to processes occurring from cloud base to $\sim$15°C ($\Delta$[MR$_{\text{top}}^\text{CB}$ to $\sim$15°C], see Text S4 in the SI) for online WRF-Chem trajectories that pass through the storm cores. Calculating the changes in mixing ratios at the top of the scavenging regions allows us to compare the effects of different processes on outflow mixing ratios among the three storms. We analyzed trajectories from the simulations with $r_f = 1$ for CH$_3$OOH and $r_f = 0$ for H$_2$O$_2$ and CH$_2$O, as these $r_f$ values provide the best agreement with SEs calculated from observations.

In the simulations without scavenging, if no simulated change in species mixing ratios occurs due to gas phase chemistry, the change in mixing ratio from one time step to the next is due solely to mixing. Photochemistry can also produce or destroy CH$_3$OOH, but Fried et al. (2016) estimate a maximum change in CH$_2$O SEs due to gas phase chemistry of 3%. The maximum change in SEs occurred for the 11–12 June MCS case, where high PBL isoprene levels led to a net production of CH$_2$O. Barth et al. (2016) found little impact of gas phase chemistry on CH$_3$OOH and H$_2$O$_2$ outflow mixing ratios.

Microphysical scavenging is the dominant removal process for CH$_2$O ($\Delta$[MR$_{\text{top}}^\text{CB}$ to $\sim$15°C] = $-0.27$ to $-2.1$ ppbv, Figure 9) and H$_2$O$_2$ ($\Delta$[MR$_{\text{top}}^\text{CB}$ to $\sim$15°C] = $-2.9$ to $-4.6$ ppbv) in all three storms and for CH$_3$OOH ($\Delta$[MR$_{\text{top}}^\text{CB}$ to $\sim$15°C] = $-0.15$ ppbv) in the air mass storm. On the other hand, depletion by entrainment is the dominant process reducing CH$_3$OOH mixing ratios ($\Delta$[MR$_{\text{top}}^\text{CB}$ to $\sim$15°C] = $-0.21$ to 0.36 ppbv) in the severe and MCS storms. In the MCS, aqueous chemistry is the second most important process and a net source for H$_2$O$_2$ ($\Delta$[MR$_{\text{top}}^\text{CB}$ to $\sim$15°C] = 1.4 ppbv). Otherwise, aqueous chemistry has the least impact of the three processes on the changes in CH$_3$OOH, CH$_2$O, and H$_2$O$_2$ mixing ratios from cloud base to the $\sim$15°C level ($\Delta$[MR$_{\text{top}}^\text{CB}$ to $\sim$15°C] = $-0.21$ to 0.0017 ppbv).

Vertical profiles of concentrations of CH$_3$OOH, CH$_2$O, and H$_2$O$_2$ and changes in number of moles of CH$_3$OOH, CH$_2$O, and H$_2$O$_2$ due to scavenging, entrainment, and aqueous chemistry, normalized to account for the different grid cell volumes and time steps in the simulations of the three storms (Figure 10), show that CH$_3$O and H$_2$O$_2$ are nearly completely removed for $T > 0$°C by precipitation scavenging. Thus, due to the higher solubilities of CH$_3$O and H$_2$O$_2$ than CH$_3$OOH, no retention in ice is needed to remove additional gas between 0°C and $\sim$15°C, as is the case for CH$_3$OOH, especially for the air mass storm. More peak scavenging, located near the freezing level, of all three species occurs for the severe storm than for the air mass storm and MCS, likely due to the higher peak precipitation production rate in the severe storm ($2.3 \times 10^{-8}$ (cm H$_2$O)$^3$ (cm air)$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$, Figure 8) than air mass storm [$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$ (cm H$_2$O)$^3$ (cm air)$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$] and MCS [$8 \times 10^{-9}$ (cm H$_2$O)$^3$ (cm air)$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$].

At a given level in a storm core, the change in the mixing ratio of a gas due to entrainment is the product of the background mixing ratio of the gas (Figure 3) and the amount of entrainment. The higher amount of maximum depletion due to entrainment in the air mass storm relative to the severe storm and MCS is due to both higher entrainment percentages from $\sim$5–10 km asl (Figure 3) and higher simulated mixing ratios of CH$_3$OOH and H$_2$O$_2$ (Figure 3) from $\sim$3–9 km asl in the air mass storm than in the severe storm and MCS. The increases in CH$_3$OOH mixing ratio at $\sim$14°C for the severe storm and $\sim$0°C for the air mass storm (Figure 10) are due to entrainment of background air.

Aqueous chemistry has a minor effect on CH$_3$OOH, with net depletion rates 3 to 10 times smaller than entrainment and scavenging of CH$_3$OOH. The highest aqueous chemistry depletion rate of CH$_3$O and H$_2$O$_2$ occurs in the severe storm at $T > 0$°C, likely because of the higher peak cloud water mixing ratios in the severe storm [$1.3 \times 10^{-6}$ (cm H$_2$O)$^3$ (cm air)$^{-3}$, Figure 8] and air mass storm [$1.2 \times 10^{-6}$ (cm H$_2$O)$^3$ (cm air)$^{-3}$] than MCS [$7 \times 10^{-7}$ (cm H$_2$O)$^3$ (cm air)$^{-3}$].
Summarizing the findings of the trajectory analysis, in the severe storm and MCS, more CH$_3$OOH is removed than expected primarily due to depletion by entrainment. On the other hand, lower CH$_3$OOH and H$_2$O$_2$ SEs in the air mass storm than in the severe storm or MCS are partly due to more replenishment by entrainment. Furthermore, ice retention is responsible for a significant portion of reductions in CH$_3$OOH mixing ratios. Finally, aqueous chemistry does not have a significant impact on outflow mixing ratios of all three species. Therefore, the trajectory analysis shows that it is reasonable to not include aqueous chemistry reactions affecting
Figure 11. Histograms of simulated CTs (min) with liquid water from WRF-Chem trajectories for (a–c) cloud base to $-15^\circ$C, (d–f) cloud base to $0^\circ$C, and (g–i) $0^\circ$C to $-15^\circ$C for severe and air mass storms and MCS, respectively. The median simulated CTs and those calculated from observations are depicted by gray and red lines, respectively. Observed and simulated CTs, maximum updraft velocities, and cloud base, $0^\circ$C, and $-15^\circ$C heights and the depths between them are listed in Table S17 in the SI. Where only the red line appears, median values from simulations and observations agree. WRF-Chem = Weather Research and Forecasting model with Chemistry; MCS = mesoscale convective system.

5.2. CT With Liquid Water

We wish to evaluate the DC3 hypothesis that CTs vary among different storm types and affect the amount of scavenging and aqueous chemistry that occurs. Typical CTs with liquid water of an air parcel traveling through the convective cores were estimated for each storm using observational data and model output. CTs with liquid water derived from observations for above freezing and mixed-phase cloud regions were calculated as follows:

$$CT_{obs}(s) = \sum_{k=a}^{b} \frac{\Delta z_k}{w_k}$$

these three species (e.g., to reduce computational cost). Thus, future research efforts should be focused on improving the realism of the scavenging schemes (e.g., calculating separate liquid phase and mixed-phase precipitation production terms, tracking concentrations of gases dissolved in each hydrometeor type) and decreasing the horizontal grid spacing to improve the simulated amount of entrainment mixing.
where $a$ is the cloud base or $0\,^\circ$C level and $b$ is the $0\,^\circ$C or $-15\,^\circ$C level, respectively; $\Delta z_k$ is the depth (m) of the radar grid cell at level $k$; and $w_k$ is the vertical velocity ($\text{ms}^{-1}$) at level $k$. While supercooled water can be found at temperatures nearly as low as $-40\,^\circ$C (Lawson et al., 2017; Rosenfeld & Woodley, 2000), we examine CTs to $-15\,^\circ$C, the top of the scavenging region in WRF-Chem. Cloud base (lifting condensation level determined from skewT plot), $0\,^\circ$C, and $-15\,^\circ$C heights were determined.

For each model trajectory that attained the minimum observed outflow altitude (severe storm: 10.34 km asl; air mass storm: 10.04 km asl; MCS: 11.85 km asl), the CTs with liquid water were determined as

$$CT_{\text{sim}}(s) = t_b - t_a$$

where $t_a (s)$ is the time the trajectory is at the $0\,^\circ$C level or $-15\,^\circ$C level and $t_b (s)$ is the time the trajectory parcel is at cloud base or the $0\,^\circ$C level for above freezing and mixed-phase regions, respectively.

Both the observations and WRF-Chem simulations show CTs to be shortest for the severe storm ($\sim 6$ min from cloud base to $0\,^\circ$C, 1.5 min from $0\,^\circ$C to $-15\,^\circ$C, Figure 11). The CTs in the MCS are at least twice as long as in the severe storm, where WRF-Chem predicts 23 min from cloud base to $0\,^\circ$C and 4.5 min from $0\,^\circ$C to $-15\,^\circ$C and the TELEX observations give 16 min from cloud base to $0\,^\circ$C and 4.4 min from $0\,^\circ$C to $-15\,^\circ$C. For the air mass storm, CTs from observations are longer (31 min from cloud base to $0\,^\circ$C and 14 min from $0\,^\circ$C to $-15\,^\circ$C) than the WRF-Chem predictions (6.5 min from cloud base to $0\,^\circ$C and 2.7 min from $0\,^\circ$C to $-15\,^\circ$C) and the estimates from observations and simulations for the other two storms. The shorter CTs predicted by WRF-Chem for the air mass storm are a result of higher simulated vertical velocities than observed ($w_{\text{max}}$ between cloud base and $-15\,^\circ$C of trajectory containing highest $w_{\text{max}} = 20.9\,\text{ms}^{-1}$, Figure 12) compared with observations ($w_{\text{max}} = 5.3\,\text{ms}^{-1}$). The overestimate in CT by WRF-Chem for the MCS may be due to lower simulated updraft velocities between cloud base and $0\,^\circ$C (Figure 12). The greatest uncertainty in the CT for the MCS is that the TELEX profile is for a different MCS and may not well represent the DC3 MCS. However, the higher-column-maximum reflectivity simulated by WRF-Chem relative to NEXRAD (Figure 1) suggest that WRF-Chem updraft velocities may indeed be higher than in the observed DC3 storm.

One of the hypotheses of DC3 was that storms with longer liquid water CTs (i.e., air mass versus severe storms) would have greater reductions in mixing ratios from cloud base to outflow due to more time available for microphysical scavenging and aqueous chemistry. However, we find that observed SEs are similar among storms for each species, despite liquid water CTs ranging from 7.5 to 45 min. The different liquid water CTs among the storms do not lead to significantly different scavenging sinks for the three species because (1) the shorter CTs in the severe storm than MCS air mass storm are compensated by higher precipitation production rates and cloud water contents (Figure 8) in the severe versus air mass storm and MCS and (2) there are lower peroxyde and CH$_2$O mixing ratios at cloud base for the air mass storm than the severe storm and MCS (Figure 3).

6. Conclusions

Aircraft measurements in inflow and outflow of deep convective storms over the central United States combined with high-resolution meteorology-chemistry simulations enable the quantification of storm processes affecting net convective transport of peroxides and CH$_2$O.

Our results complement the evidence in Bela et al. (2016) that CH$_3$O $r_f$ values, determined by comparing the SEs calculated from WRF-Chem sensitivity simulations of the MCS with SEs obtained from aircraft observations, are <0.25. The simulated CH$_3$OOH SEs for the air mass storm and MCS were highly sensitive to the $r_f$ value, indicating that ice retention is a significant component of CH$_3$OOH removal. On the other hand, for CH$_2$O and H$_2$O$_2$, $r_f$ values greater than 0.5 and 0.25, respectively, result in simulated SEs greater than 90%, much higher than those calculated from observations.

However, the WRF-Chem simulations may overestimate rain and hail production, potentially affecting the confidence in the determined $r_f$ values. For WRF-Chem simulations of all three storms, 35 dBZ volumes
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(a proxy for graupel/hail volumes) of the main storm cores were much greater than those calculated from NEXRAD radar. For the air mass storm, simulated hail volumes were much greater than those from a dual-polarimetric radar analysis. Simulated maximum updraft velocities in the air mass storm were up to 4 times higher than from a dual-polarimetric radar analysis, further indicating the simulated storm was more severe than occurred. Mass concentrations of cloud water, rain, hail, and cloud ice simulated by WRF-Chem were generally higher than those calculated by a diabatic Lagrangian analysis model with input from time-dependent 3-D radar-analyzed wind and reflectivity fields. Since the amount of scavenging is determined by both the \( r_f \) value and the precipitation production rate, the true \( r_f \) values could be higher than determined from simulations (Bela et al., 2016 and this study) for CH\(_3\)OOH, which is affected by both liquid and mixed-phase scavenging, and CH\(_2\)O and H\(_2\)O\(_2\), which are primarily scavenged by rain. We note that although the severe storm and MCS simulations use different microphysics schemes, the temperature ranges of peak precipitation production in the online WRF-Chem trajectories are similar among the three storm simulations. Therefore, we do not think the choice of microphysics schemes affects the relative contributions of above freezing and mixed-phase scavenging for these three storms.

We used output from WRF-Chem online trajectories to calculate the net effects of scavenging, entrainment, and aqueous chemistry on mixing ratios of CH\(_3\)OOH, CH\(_2\)O, and H\(_2\)O\(_2\) at the \( T = -15^\circ\text{C} \) level, the lowest temperature at which mixed-phase scavenging is assumed to occur in the WRF-Chem scavenging scheme. This analysis was used to explain the results of Barth et al. (2016) and Bela et al. (2016) that CH\(_3\)OOH SEs were much higher than the expected values of <10% based on previous aircraft campaigns and the low solubility of CH\(_3\)OOH. In the severe storm and the MCS, more CH\(_3\)OOH is removed than expected, primarily due to depletion by entrainment. In the air mass storm, CH\(_3\)OOH and H\(_2\)O\(_2\) SES were lower than in the MCS, in part due to replenishment by entrainment of free tropospheric air. Measurements in other DC3 storms show that substantial mixing ratios of CH\(_3\)OOH are found in the midtroposphere (Barth et al., 2016). Although H\(_2\)O\(_2\) has even higher midtropospheric mixing ratios, its much higher solubility than CH\(_3\)OOH means that entrainment of midtropospheric air has a smaller impact on outflow mixing ratios of H\(_2\)O\(_2\) than CH\(_3\)OOH. Thus, although there is some variability in peroxide removal among storms with differing background profiles, in general, we expect CH\(_3\)OOH to be more affected than H\(_2\)O\(_2\) by entrainment of background air. Above-freezing microphysical scavenging was the dominant process reducing CH\(_2\)O and H\(_2\)O\(_2\) mixing ratios from cloud base to the top of the scavenging region in all three storms. Thus, liquid water CT does not affect SES much because all three storms have sufficient CT to attain the potential amount of scavenging. Furthermore, aqueous chemistry sinks are so small that even a CT of 45 min in the air mass storm still does not result in significant reductions in peroxide mixing ratios.

The results of this study provide guidance for the development of model parameterizations of convective transport of gases affecting O\(_3\) and aerosol distributions, and thus air quality and climate. Coordinated observations in inflow and outflow of different storms, including air mass storms in the Southeast United States, and in different regions of the world should be done to better quantify \( r_f \). The WRF-Chem scavenging scheme is a simple approach that is computationally efficient yet allowed us to study removal processes inside deep convective clouds. In terms of model development, the WRF-Chem wet scavenging scheme could be improved by adding a parameterization for ice retention fraction, such as that proposed by Jost et al. (2017), in which \( r_f \) is a function of the effective Henry's law coefficient, accounting for chemical reactions such as the hydration of CH\(_2\)O whose rates are of similar time scales to mass transfer. Rather than use the total precipitation production rate to calculate wet removal, the individual production rates of rain, snow, and hail should be used so that different ice retention factors could be applied for dry growth riming (e.g., \( r_f = 0.59–0.97 \) for H\(_2\)O\(_2\) and CH\(_2\)O, Jost et al., 2017) and wet growth riming (e.g., \( r_f < 0.2 \) for H\(_2\)O\(_2\) and CH\(_2\)O, Michael & Stuart, 2009).

References


