Dear authors, in my role as Executive editor of GMD, I would like to bring to your attention our Editorial version 1.2: https://www.geosci-model-dev.net/12/2215/2019/.

This highlights some requirements of papers published in GMD, which is also available on the GMD website in the 'Manuscript Types' section: http://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/submission/manuscript_types.html. In particular, please note that for your paper, the following requirement has not been met in the Discussions paper: "The main paper must give the model name and version number (or other unique identifier) in the title." Please add the AtChem version number to the title of your revised manuscript

We thank the editor for bringing this point to our attention. The title of the manuscript has been changed to: "AtChem (version 1), an open source box-model for the Master Chemical Mechanism".

Please also note that Beth S. Nelson has been added as co-author and more information on the version of AtChem presented in the manuscript has been added to the text, following comments by both referees.

Additionally, please note, that GMD is encouraging authors to provide a persistent access to the exact version of the source code used for the model version presented in the paper. As explained in https://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/about/manuscript_types.html the preferred reference to this release is through the use of a DOI which then can be cited in the paper. For projects in GitHub a DOI for a released code version can easily be created using Zenodo, see https://guides.github.com/activities/citable-code/ for details.

A DOI (10.5281/zenodo.3404021) has been created on Zenodo and added to the GitHub release page and to Section 2 of the manuscript.

Finally note, that according to our new Editorial (v1.2) all data and analysis / plotting scripts should be made available.

All data used in the manuscript are available at the repositories indicated in the "Code and data availability." section. Plotting scripts are not relevant in this case.

Anonymous Referee #1

This paper documents a boxmodeling system for the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM). The MCM is a very large, near explicit mechanism describing the degradation of 143 primary compounds into CO2 and H2O. As such, the MCM is too computationally expensive to be run in global chemistry models or even air quality models. However the MCM is often used to benchmark smaller 'lumped' chemistry schemes by comparison using a zero-dimensional boxmodel, or by comparison with results from controlled chamber experiments. Much of the boxmodeling work in the past used expensive commercial software, and this new open source system was developed in part to avoid these costs, but also to provide potential additional capability beyond commercial 'black-box' systems. The paper is generally well written, with examples provided on how the model works and performs. However, AtChem is presented as being a new and novel free system (line 52) without acknowledging any of the recent efforts to produce similar open source boxmodels, some if not all are also designed to run the MCM. These models are missing from the literature review. The literature cited between lines 23-29 are studies using boxmodels, some were commercial like FACSIMILE, some not. The review does not cover the models themselves. I have scored 'fair' for scientific significance (substantial new concepts, ideas, or methods) and scientific quality (consideration of related work, including appropriate references) based on this and the decision not to upgrade the representation of photolysis, which many of the other open source boxmodels have done (see major questions). If the paper is to be published, acknowledgement of previous work towards production of open source boxmodels should be included in the literature review. I also would suggest the authors look into (at least comparing) other photolysis schemes.

We thank the referee for their comments and suggestions. Please find below our replies and the related modifications to the manuscript. The line numbers refer to the version of the manuscript published on GMDD.

Major questions

More than 10 years ago, the MCM website moved to output the entire mechanism (or a chosen subset) in a variety of formats. One of those formats was KPP (kinetic PreProcessor software) which is the basis for some of these recent open source codes – Knote et al's (2015) boxmodel extensions to KPP (BOXMOX, https://www2.acom.ucar.edu/modeling/boxmox-box-model-extensions-kpp), Sander et al's (2011) Chemistry As A Box Model Application (CAABA), and the Dynamically Simple Model of Atmospheric Chemical Complexity (DSMACC, http://wiki.seas.harvard.edu/geos-chem/index.php/DSMACC_chemical_box_model) (Emmerson and Evans, 2009). There is a wiki page listing 10 of these models: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinetic_PreProcessor I am also aware of boxmodels which do not use these KPP format codes – F0AM (Wolfe et al., 2016) uses Matlab. So I'm missing why the authors developed their own model from scratch rather than building on another system which is freely available?

References to other open source modelling frameworks have been added to the manuscript. With regard to the question of why AtChem was developed from scratch instead of building on other work, it should be noted that AtChem-online has been available for some time. The first version of the model was released in 2010, although there was not an accompanying publication at the time.

Although this has changed in the past few years (as the referee points out), at the time the choice of modelling tools was rather limited and the available ones were expensive and/or not very easy to use for novice modellers. As explained in the introduction (lines 50-60) and at the beginning of Section 2 (lines 75-76), AtChem-online was created as a free community modelling toolkit to facilitate the use of the MCM within the EUROCHAMP atmospheric chamber

community, by providing a tool that could be used by researchers without an experienced modelling background.

The offline version, Atchem2, was released more recently (in 2017) and is based on the same code as AtChem-online. Therefore, Atchem2 is not a new model, but a development and an improvement of a pre-existing model. Given the fact that a paper about AtChem-online had not been published, it just makes sense that the older online version of the model is presented together with the newer offline version. This has the added benefit of documenting the model developments within the formal literature.

The final paragraph of the Introduction has been modified as follow:

"AtChem was conceived with the above principles and objectives in mind: the code is free, open source and publicly available. It was released online in 2010, introduced to the EUROCHAMP community via a two day workshop, and briefly described in the annual EUROCHAMP report in late 2010. In recent years, a number of other open source modelling tools and frameworks have been released: some include their own chemical mechanism (e.g., CAABA, Sander et al. (2011)), while others are designed to use primarily the MCM (e.g., PyBox, Topping et al. (2018)). Most these tools – such as DSMACC (Emmerson and Evans, 2009), BOXMOX (Knote et al., 2015), and F0AM (Wolfe et al., 2016) – give the user the flexibility to run different chemical mechanisms. Although AtChem was designed mainly to encourage the use of the MCM in atmospheric chemistry studies (and hence to facilitate its evaluation by the community), it can be easily adapted to model other chemical systems and to use other chemical mechanisms, as long as they are provided in the correct format."

The method for calculating photolysis rates in AtChem is a shortcoming. AtChem uses (quite an old) 2-stream method for calculating photolysis rates, and looking at figure 4, consistently underpredicts the measured rates. This photolysis scheme has been used with MCM modeling for ~ 20 years or so. Yes, it is important to adjust for cloudy conditions using measured photolysis rates. However not all investigators (and particularly students using AtChem in the classroom) have the luxury of being able to measure photolysis rates to perform the correction in equation 4, or to use directly as a constraint. If equation 3 can only be relied upon to produce good results at 500 m altitude, 45 degrees N on July 1st, then why was the photolysis method not updated given the opportunity for designing this new system? If AtChem had used one of the other open source systems as a basis, photolysis could be calculated on-line, where such parameters can be changed. CAABA gives users a range of options for calculating photolysis – JVAL, RADJIMT, DISSOC, (Sander et al., 2019). There's also FAST-JX (Wild et al., 2000) which users of GEOSChem and the UK chemistry and aerosol (UKCA) community prefer (https://www.ess.uci.edu/researchgrp/prather/scholar_software/fast-jx). BOXMOX and DSMACC use the Tropospheric Ultraviolet and Visible radiation (TUV, (Madronich and Flocke, 1997)), now at version 5.3.2 https://www2.acom.ucar.edu/modeling/tuv-download. i.e., there are plenty of other systems available. Given that photolysis is so important to OH production, correcting the underestimation produced by the 2-steam method is crucial for AtChem to be of use to other researchers, and should be considered.

There is a misunderstanding here about the calculation of the photolysis rates.

First, it is important to distinguish between what is in the MCM and what is in AtChem. The MCM uses a 2-stream scattering model to calculate the photolysis rates of the relevant species; a fitting procedure to the 2-stream scattering model results is then used to derive the empirical parameters l, m, n, which are used in Equation 3 to calculate the photolysis rates as a function of the solar zenith angle in a computationally efficient manner. This methodology is explained in the MCM protocol papers (Jenkin et al, 1997, Saunders et al., 2003). AtChem does not use the 2-stream scattering model, but simply implements Equation 3.

Second, the values of the empirical parameters l, m, n are not prescribed in AtChem, which takes the values of the version of the MCM that is being used. The reason for this approach is that AtChem is designed to use the MCM as is. We think it is not up to the AtChem developers to correct or fix the MCM; this is a task better left to the MCM developers and documented within the MCM protocol. Moreover, nothing prevents the users from providing their own set of empirical parameters based on their preferred photolysis scheme (as stated on lines 229-230). Alternatively, the photolysis rates can be constrained to measurements or to offline-calculated values, as is frequently done by MCM modellers (see line 232). It is left to the users to decide how they wish to parametrise/constrain the photolysis rates, based on their specific needs.

Finally, we do agree with the referee that the 2-stream scattering model is no longer up to date. Indeed, the next version of the MCM will use an updated version of the TUV model to calculate the photolysis rates. But this does not mean that equation 3 will no longer be used. It simply means that the output of TUV will be used to derive a new set of l, m, n parameters. We have no evidence that equation 3 is not reliable and therefore we see no reason to design a new method to calculate the photolysis rates in AtChem. It is however true that the set of l, m, n used in the current version of the MCM (3.3.1) would benefit from an update.

To make this point clearer the following modifications have been made to the manuscript:

Lines 225-227: sentence changed to "The empirical parameters l, m, n are calculated, for each version of the MCM, as explained by Jenkin et al. (1997) and Saunders et al. (2003): in the MCM v3.3.1 (and previous versions), the empirical parameters are obtained by fitting Eq. 3 to the output of a two-stream isotropic scattering model, which incorporates the appropriate photolysis cross-sections and quantum yields."

Line 230: "to replace the default values of l, m, n and τ ." changed to "to replace the values of l, m, n and τ provided by the MCM"

Line 232: changed to "The photolysis rates can also be set to constant values, constrained to measured data or constrained to values calculated offline using a suitable radiative transfer model"

Line 250: "in Eq. 3" changed to "in the MCM"

As this is a model description paper, please explain how the dilution factor is calculated. In a number of places in the text constraining the boundary layer height is mentioned which would impact the chemical concentrations, but it is not explained. This also applies to the chamber open roof experiments. Please also mention whether the model has a capability for entrainment of stratospheric air into the troposphere (which is a feature of BOXMOX), or exchange of air with air masses outside the box (a feature of CAABA).

A complete explanation of each environment variable can be found in the AtChem manual, which is included with the AtChem code. To clarify the (optional) usage of the variables used to parametrise the emission, dilution and deposition of chemical species, the following paragraph has been added to Section 2.2:

"Chemical reactions can also be written without reactants or products, which is useful to parametrise non-chemical processes in the model, if required. For example, emission of species P1 can be parametrised as:

% Er : = P1 ;

where Er is the emission rate in s-1 . Likewise, dry deposition and dilution of species R1 can be parametrised, respectively, as:

% Vd/BLHEIGHT : R1 = ;
% DILUTE : R1 = ;

where Vd is the deposition velocity in cm s-1 , BLHEIGHT is the boundary layer height in cm and DILUTE is the dilution rate in s-1. BLHEIGHT and DILUTE are environment variables (Sect. 2.3), and therefore can be set to a value chosen by the user or constrained to prescribed values."

AtChem does not explicitly include entrainment of stratospheric air into the troposphere, although this process can be easily parametrised in the same way as the emissions can be parametrised. Note that the description of non-chemical processes outlined above is rather simplistic, although it is good enough for several applications. Implementation of more sophisticated approaches to model non-chemical processes is left to the users, according to their specific needs.

The choice of examples shown to demonstrate the AtChem system are at odds with the description of why it was developed. For example line 345 "AtChem2 was developed specifically for the long and complex simulations need for field studies". AtChem2 is then demonstrated using only 2 days from a ∼40 day TEXAQs campaign. Were these two days chosen because they provided the best model-observation comparison? Why not show the whole TEXAQs time series, which would show that AtChem has been rigorously tested?

We chose to show only 3 days of the TexAQS model simulation mainly for reasons of clarity and simplicity. The entire model run, and associated analysis, is shown in Sommariva et al., (2011) and, although it was performed with an older version of AtChem, the agreement between the two versions is good (see line 359 and the modified Figure 7). We don't think that showing the whole time series would add much to this paper, which is a technical manuscript within the "Model description papers" remit of GMD.

It is true that the example in Section 3.2 is meant to show how AtChem2 can be used to carry out long simulations. However, please keep in mind that a fully constrained model, such as the one used for the TexAQS campaign, runs almost in real time. Depending on the computer system, a 3 days simulation takes between 2 and 4 days to complete. This is much longer than the chamber simulation shown in Section 3.1, which was completed in a couple of hours. Therefore we feel that the example shown in Section 3.2 provides an adequate demonstration of the enhanced capabilities of AtChem2.

Editorial comments

Title. I think GMD prefers a version number to be assigned to the model being described.

The version number has been added to the title (see also reply to the Editor's comments).

line 174 represents the start of a new paragraph but mentions 'this' modeling technique, which is not defined, or must relate to the paragraph above. I assume the latter, in which case it isn't a new paragraph.

The line break has been removed.

Line 204. 'study' not studies

Corrected.

Line 268. "since the model...' This and the following sentence are both very long, and could be broken up.

The paragraph has been rewritten as:

"The model configuration and constraints are read by the executable at runtime: there is no need to compile the model more than once, unless the chemical mechanism or parts of the source code are modified by the user (Fig. 5). This approach makes it quick and easy to set up batch model runs. With AtChem-online batch model runs are not possible because compilation is automatically performed on the web server when the model run is started: the chemical mechanism, the configuration files and the model constraints have to be uploaded via the Web Interface before every run and the model has to be recompiled every time it is executed, regardless of the changes that the user has made."

Line 350. Why is the latest version of the MCM not being used here?

The reason is that we wanted to be consistent with the model results published in Sommariva et al. (2011). See also the reply to a similar comment by referee #2.

Line 371. The reader needs to know what compounds were being constrained here – for example I'm assuming NO was constrained because of the statement about NO being the main destruction term. Earlier in this section reference is given to the model set-up in Sommariva et al (Sommariva et al., 2011), but as the results here rely upon the constraints they should be stated.

The sentence at line 353 has been rewritten as:

"The model constraints – CO, CH4 , H2 , NO, NO2 , O3 , SO2 , H2O, 65 VOC, j(O1D), j(NO2), j(NO3), aerosol surface area, temperature, pressure, latitude and longitude – and configuration were the same as in the model described by Sommariva et al. (2011)."

Figure 2. the plots are too small to be seen properly.

The size of the figure has been increased.

Figure 6, top right panel. A legend is missing for the three colors.

The legend has been corrected.

Anonymous Referee #2

1 General comments

The paper describes a new open-source box model designed primarily for runs using the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM), although other mechanisms can also be modelled provided they are entered in the correct format. The model comes in two forms, one (the original) available online via a web-interface, and a downloadable one (AtChem2) suitable for more advanced studies including batch runs that can be executed on the user's machine. The box model is presented as being free and easy to use, and having functionality that makes it particularly suitable for comparison against observational data, due to the way it handles constrained variables with different time frequencies. It is applied in two case studies to chamber and field data respectively to illustrate that it can handle these scenarios and allow us to reach some conclusions about which parts of the mechanism need to be reviewed. I believe this paper will be suitable for publication subject to revision.

We thank the referee for their comments and suggestions. Please find below our replies and the related modifications to the manuscript. The line numbers refer to the version of the manuscript published on GMDD.

2 Specific comments

The text in the paper is generally well-written and easy to follow. The figures are less clear, however. In particular, Figure 2 is too small to make much sense of even when zoomed in on (due to the scale); the outlier marker is larger than some of the box-and-whiskers. Figure 3 is missing some arrowheads, and the ones that are there are too small to be clearly seen. In Figure 6, the ozone and nitrogen oxides lines/markers are not labelled as to which is which; I would also recommend using different marker shapes when presenting multiple datasets in one graph in addition to using different colours.

The sizes of Figure 2 and 6 have been increased.
The arrows in Figure 3 have been fixed.
Markers have been added to Figure 6 and the legend has been corrected.

I think the paper could highlight in detail what makes AtChem stand out over specific other box models. The two forms (online/offline) appear to have different unique benefits, and perhaps need to be discussed separately. It appears that the online model can at present only be run with login details (is it only for use by the EUROCHAMP community?), which might restrict takeup (especially for teaching purposes), but I hope this is something the authors are planning to address. I also note that the online form does not seem to readily support the newest MCM version; perhaps this can be updated?

The referee is correct that the two versions of AtChem presented in this paper have different objectives, as well as different benefits and limitations (please note that the login details are available to anybody upon request, as indicated on the AtChem-online website, at https://atchem.leeds.ac.uk/webapp/). The history and the purpose of the two versions of AtChem are explained in the Introduction and in Section 2.1; we have also added more information about other open-source models in the Introduction (see the reply to a comment by referee #1).

Both versions of AtChem can be used with any version of the MCM, or with any general set of chemical reactions, as long as they are in the prescribed format. In fact, the examples in Section 3 were run with two different versions of the MCM (see below).

Given the commonality of the codebase we don't think it makes sense to divide the paper into two parts, each discussing a version of AtChem, as this would result in much repetition. We feel

that the features and the characteristics that distinguish the two versions of the model are clearly identified as such in the manuscript.

Parts of the paper are using different versions of the MCM and perhaps also different versions of AtChem(2). In particular, on page 12 the section on lines 358-360 describes that the previously published results were off by a small amount due to a bug in a previous version of AtChem; however, at no point does the paper make reference to which version(s) of AtChem(2) were used in the runs. I would suggest carrying out all the model runs with the latest version of AtChem2 and annotating them as such. If the latest MCM version was not used for modelling the field study data for consistency with the previous paper analysing this data, I would comment on this, but also perhaps rerun the simulation with the newest MCM version for comparison.

All the model results discussed in Section 3 have been run with the same version of AtChem (version 1). The sentence on page 12, lines 358-360 refers to the model results published in Sommariva et al. (2011), not to those presented in this manuscript. The following changes have been made to the manuscript to clarify these points:

Lines 71-72: changed to "This paper presents version 1 of AtChem, and is divided into two parts"

Line 78: added "(version 1.5, rev. 146)"

Line 92: added " Version 1.0 of AtChem2 (doi:10.5281/zenodo.3404021) is presented here, and has been used for the model simulations shown in Sect. 3."

Line 358: changed to "The results obtained with version 1 of AtChem2 and with the beta version of AtChem used by Sommariva et al. (2011a) differ by $\sim$3%"

It is true that different versions of the MCM are used in the paper. Specifically version 3.3.1 was used in Section 3.1 (chamber study example) and version 3.1 was used in Section 3.2 (field campaign example); the reason for this is that we wanted the model used in this paper to be directly comparable with the model used by Sommariva et al. (2011), in which the full model/measurement time series is presented.

For the objectives of this paper, the comparison between different versions of AtChem is more relevant than the comparison between different versions of the MCM, which is extensively covered in the updates to the original MCM protocol (e.g., see Saunders et al., 2003; Jenkin et al., 2015). If the same version of the MCM is used with the same configuration/constraints, then any difference between the two models can only be due to changes in the AtChem code (which was the case, see lines 358-360). To make this point clearer, Figure 7 was modified by adding the model results from Sommariva et al. (2011) and the text was modified as follows:

Lines 350-351: "The chemical mechanism used here was extracted from the MCM v3.1 (as in Sommariva et al. (2011a)): it included the inorganic chemistry scheme, the oxidation mechanism of 65 VOC, the dimethyl sulfide (DMS) oxidation mechanism from Sommariva et al. (2009), plus dry deposition terms and heterogeneous reactions for the appropriate gas-phase species."

Lines 354-356: moved to line 349.

3 Technical corrections

p7, line 204: change "studies" to "study"

Corrected.

p7, line 214: change "results" to "result" and correct spelling of "stiffness"

Corrected.

p8, line 224: Eq. 3 appears to use two different forms of the multiplication sign

Corrected.

p12, line 351: IUPAC spelling is "sulfide"

Corrected.

p22, label on Figure 4: the local time is GMT−7 in the winter, but GMT−6 in the summer due to daylight saving time

The plot is showing the correct times in GMT. The caption of Figure 4 has been corrected as suggested.

p27, in Table 1: "SO2" should have 2 as a subscript.

Corrected.

There is inconsistent use of American and British spellings (s/z) in the manuscript, and though it is a very minor issue, this can perhaps be standardised. I also feel that a few more hyphens would aid easy parsing of the text in places (e.g. p7, line 205 as well as Figure 2 label: "9-days"; p9, line 250 as well as p8, line 226: "two-stream").

The spelling has been corrected to British English. The hyphens have been added, as suggested.

AtChem (version 1), an open source box-model for the Master Chemical Mechanism

Roberto Sommariva[1,5], Sam Cox[2], Chris Martin[3,4], Kasia Borońska[4], Jenny Young[3], Peter K. Jimack[4], Michael J. Pilling[3], Vasileios N. Matthaios[5], Beth S. Nelson[6], Mike J. Newland[6], Marios Panagi[1], William J. Bloss[5], Paul S. Monks[1], and Andrew R. Rickard[6,7]

[1]Department of Chemistry, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK
[2]Research Software Engineering Team, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK
[3]School of Chemistry, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
[4]School of Computing, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
[5]School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
[6]Wolfson Atmospheric Chemistry Laboratories, Department of Chemistry, University of York, York, UK
[7]National Centre for Atmospheric Science, University of York, York, UK

Correspondence: R. Sommariva (rob.sommariva@gmail.com)

Abstract. AtChem is an open source zero-dimensional box-model for atmospheric chemistry. Any general set of chemical reactions can be used with AtChem, but the model was designed specifically for use with the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM, http://mcm.york.ac.uk/). AtChem was initially developed within the EUROCHAMP project as a web application (AtChem-online, https://atchem.leeds.ac.uk/webapp/) for modelling environmental chamber experiments; it was recently upgraded and

5   further developed into a standalone offline version (AtChem2) which allows the user to run complex and long simulations, such as those needed for modelling of intensive field campaigns, as well as to perform batch model runs for sensitivity studies. AtChem is installed, set up and configured using semi-automated scripts and simple text configuration files, making it easy to use even for non-experienced users. A key feature of AtChem is that it can easily be constrained to observational data which may have different timescales, thus retaining all the information contained in the observations. Implementation of a continuous

10   integration workflow, coupled with a comprehensive suite of tests and version control software, makes the AtChem codebase robust, reliable and traceable. The AtChem2 code and documentation are available at https://github.com/AtChem/, under the open source MIT license.

1 Introduction

Computational models play an integral role in the study of atmospheric chemistry, air quality and climate. The interpretation of

15   ambient measurements and of laboratory/environmental chamber experiments relies on chemical models, which, in turn, inform and direct the focus of field studies and of the experimental investigations of fundamental chemical and physical processes (Abbatt et al., 2014; Burkholder et al., 2017). Of particular importance to atmospheric chemistry are zero-dimensional box-models: this type of model considers the chemical species within an air parcel to be uniformly distributed, so that all points within the box are equivalent, effectively reducing the model to a single, zero-dimensional, point. This modelling approach is

useful because it allows the user to focus on the fast radical chemistry and to neglect, to a first approximation, the effects of physical and meteorological parameters.

Zero-dimensional box-models have long been used to analyse ambient measurements and environmental chamber experiments. There is a natural mapping between a zero-dimensional box-model and the static nature of a measurement site (Eisele et al., 1994; Carslaw et al., 1999; Emmerson et al., 2007; Elshorbany et al., 2009; Lu et al., 2012; Edwards et al., 2014; Brune et al., 2016; Whalley et al., 2016) and of an environmental chamber (Carter, 1995; Bloss et al., 2005a; Metzger et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2015; Novelli et al., 2018). With some modifications, the same modelling approach can also be used to analyse ship-based (Brauers et al., 2001; Sommariva et al., 2009, 2011a) and aircraft-based (Chen et al., 2005; Ren et al., 2008; Sommariva et al., 2008, 2011b) observations, and to simulate the chemical evolution and photochemical processing of air masses (Derwent et al., 2003; Madronich, 2006; Roberts et al., 2007).

The core of a zero-dimensional box-model is the chemical mechanism, which describes the chemical system that is being modelled. At a mathematical level, the chemical mechanism is a system of coupled ordinary differential equations (ODEs) in the form:

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{y}}{dt} = f(t, \boldsymbol{y}), \qquad \boldsymbol{y}(t_0) = \boldsymbol{y_0} \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{y}$ is the vector of the concentrations of the chemical species in the mechanism and t is time. The system of ODEs is then solved versus time from the vector of the initial concentrations of each species ($\boldsymbol{y_0}$) using a numerical integrator. Atmospheric chemical mechanisms can be very large, requiring an efficient mathematical solver capable of dealing with hundreds or thousands of ordinary differential equations (i.e., chemical reactions).

One of the most widely used chemical mechanisms for atmospheric chemistry is the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM, http://mcm.york.ac.uk/, previously at http://mcm.leeds.ac.uk/). The MCM is a near-explicit chemical mechanism which describes the gas-phase oxidation of 143 (in version 3.3.1) primary emitted Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) to carbon dioxide (CO_2) and water (H_2O). The MCM was originally assembled to model ozone formation (Derwent et al., 1998, 2003) and has since been adopted by the atmospheric chemistry community for a wide variety of research applications, as well as for policy and education activities. The protocol used to assemble the MCM was described in Jenkin et al. (1997), and subsequently updated in Saunders et al. (2003); Jenkin et al. (2003); Bloss et al. (2005b); Jenkin et al. (2015). The MCM protocol is designed to strike a balance between the need to preserve the complexity of the chemical system and the necessity to contain its size, in order to make it computationally efficient. For this reason, the MCM has often been used as a benchmark to evaluate and optimise more complicated or more simple chemical mechanisms (Emmerson and Evans, 2009; Chen et al., 2010; Jenkin et al., 2002; Knote et al., 2015; Jenkin et al., 2019) and to generate reduced chemical mechanisms for use in three-dimensional chemical transport models, which need to be orders of magnitude smaller than the MCM, owing to the limitations of computational power (Jenkin et al., 2002, 2019).

This paper presents the AtChem box-model, developed with four main objectives as part of the EUROCHAMP project (https://www.eurochamp.org/), which coordinates the activities of environmental and atmospheric simulation chambers in Eu-

rope. The first objective was to create a free and user-friendly model to facilitate the use of the Master Chemical Mechanism. Although access to the MCM database is fairly simple – via the tools available on the MCM website – the chemical mechanism alone cannot be used directly and, therefore, the setup and configuration of a complete box-model may be difficult for a non-experienced user. AtChem incorporates the chemical mechanism into a program that manages the initial conditions and the various inputs required, so that the ODE system can be integrated by a numerical solver, with the outputs made available to the user in a suitable format. Second, there is a need to keep the MCM updated to the latest developments and experimental studies. To this end, an easy-to-use model that allows the atmospheric chemistry community to quickly run simulations of their experiments and provide feedback to the MCM maintainers/developers is highly desirable. Third, box-models are very useful tools for teaching and outreach. AtChem was initially developed as a web application, which is simple to use in a classroom (at university level) and can even be used to communicate with the general public, as well as for citizen science initiatives. Finally, there are increasing concerns in the scientific community about the sustainability, traceability and reproducibility of computational models (Ince et al., 2012; Shamir et al., 2013; Bonet et al., 2014). Scientific code is often developed by programmers who don't have a software engineering background and therefore it may lack strict adherence to language standards, use of modern programming techniques, and sometimes even proper documentation, which may make it difficult to reproduce published model studies and results, a key aspect of the scientific process. Addressing all these issues requires well documented, open source code, rigorously tested, and consistent tracking and documentation of all changes.

AtChem was conceived with the above principles and objectives in mind: the code is free, open source and publicly available. It was released online in 2010, introduced to the EUROCHAMP community via a two day workshop, and briefly described in the annual EUROCHAMP report in late 2010. In recent years, a number of other open source modelling tools and frameworks have been released: some include their own chemical mechanism (e.g., CAABA, Sander et al. (2011)), while others are designed to use primarily the MCM (e.g., PyBox, Topping et al. (2018)). Most of these tools – such as DSMACC (Emmerson and Evans, 2009), BOXMOX (Knote et al., 2015), and F0AM (Wolfe et al., 2016) – give the user the flexibility to run different chemical mechanisms. Although AtChem was designed mainly to encourage the use of the MCM in atmospheric chemistry studies (and hence to facilitate its evaluation by the community), it can be easily adapted to model other chemical systems and to use other chemical mechanisms, as long as they are provided in the correct format. This paper presents version 1 of AtChem, and is divided into two parts: Section 2 describes the AtChem model architecture, setup and configuration, while Section 3 demonstrates its use for modelling environmental chamber experiments and ambient measurements.

2   Description of the AtChem model

2.1   Model architecture

AtChem was initially developed as a web application to provide a modelling tool for laboratory and environmental chamber studies that could be used by both experienced and novice users, particularly within the EUROCHAMP community. The original version, which will be referred to as AtChem-online in this paper, is compiled and run on a dedicated web server and can be used with just a text editor, file compression software, a web browser and an internet connection. AtChem-online

is accessible at https://atchem.leeds.ac.uk/webapp/, with a simple tutorial available at http://mcm.york. ac.uk/atchem/tutorial_intro.htt: the user simply needs to provide the chemical mechanism, the configuration files and the model parameters via a web form. The model results are stored on the web server and can be downloaded as compressed zip files for further processing and analysis.

90   While relatively simple and easy to use, AtChem-online has a number of limitations, mostly related to its nature as a web application. It cannot be customised by a user beyond what the Web Interface allows and, more importantly, it cannot be used for batch model runs – i.e., multiple runs of the same model with minor and/or incremental modifications, a modelling approach which is very useful for sensitivity studies. Moreover, the models required for ambient measurements and field campaigns are often more complex than those required for environmental chambers and laboratory experiments and need to be run for longer

95   periods of time (several hours or days). Such models can be computationally very expensive and are therefore difficult to run from a web server with limited resources.

AtChem2 was developed from AtChem-online to overcome these limitations. The aim of AtChem2 was to create an offline version of AtChem capable of running long simulations of computationally intensive models and to make it possible to run batch simulations. Version 1.0 of AtChem2 (doi:10.5281/zenodo.3404021) is presented here, and has been used for the model

100   simulations shown in Sect. 3. Although the codebase has been extensively reworked, the basic architectures of AtChem-online and AtChem2 are very similar (Fig. 1). The structure and functions of AtChem are organised in five independent components, plus the chemical mechanism which is provided externally (Sect. 2.2):

 – Web Interface: graphical user interface of AtChem-online, accessible via a web browser. In AtChem2, which does not run as a web application, this component has been removed.

105 – Configuration Layer: initial conditions, model constraints, input and output variables, model and solver parameters.

 – Processing Layer: conversion of the chemical mechanism into Fortran format, sum of organic peroxy radicals (RO_2), parametrisation of photolysis rates.

 – Logic Layer: conversion of the chemical mechanism and of the model configuration into a system of coupled ODEs, boundary conditions of the ODE system.

110 – Mathematical Layer: interpolation of constrained variables, integration of the ODE system.

Most of the AtChem codebase is written in Fortran 90/95; Python and shell scripts are used in the Web Interface, the Processing Layer and the Configuration Layer. The source code of AtChem-online is available at https://atchem.leeds.ac.uk/sources/, while the source code and the documentation of AtChem2 are available at https://github.com/AtChem/, under the open source MIT license. AtChem2 can be installed on a Unix/Linux or macOS machine and requires the user to have an

115   elementary knowledge of the Unix shell. Installation of AtChem2 (and of its dependencies) is semi-automated via a number of well documented scripts that require minimal input from the user. The compilation of AtChem2, which is also done via a script, creates an executable file which reads the configuration of the model at runtime from a directory chosen by the user. For

both versions of AtChem, the model configuration – including inputs, outputs and constrained variables – is set via simple text files, which can be modified with a normal text editor. In AtChem2 the configuration files are stored in a dedicated directory, while in AtChem-online they need to be uploaded (together with the chemical mechanism) to the web server.

The AtChem-online codebase (rev. 146) was the starting point for the development of AtChem2. Several parts of the code were modified: the web tools were removed, the code was reorganised in Fortran modules, thoroughly commented and partially rewritten to fully conform to the Fortran 90/95 standard. An important addition to AtChem2 is the implementation of a continuous integration workflow for the development of the model coupled with an extensive suite of tests, which means that every change to the source code is automatically checked against previous model results before being accepted into the codebase. In recent years, continuous integration and testing have become standard practice in the software industry, allowing programmers to quickly detect bugs and errors, to ensure that modifications to the code do not result in unintended behaviour, and to improve the overall quality of the code. The suite of tests in AtChem2 includes unit tests of individual model functions and complete model runs: it is designed to cover a significant percentage of the codebase ($\sim$90%) and a wide range of common model configurations. Together with the use of the open source version control software git (https://git-scm.com/), these modern software development practices make the AtChem2 model easy to maintain, robust and reliable, as well as fully traceable and reproducible.

2.2 Chemical mechanism

AtChem is designed to use the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM) as its chemical mechanism. The entire MCM, or a subset of it, can be downloaded from the MCM website in a variety of formats using the online extraction tool (http://mcm.york.ac.uk/extract.htt). The current version of AtChem requires the chemical mechanism to be provided in a format compatible with the one used by FACSIMILE (Curtis and Sweetenham, 1987), a common commercial software for modelling the kinetics of chemical and physical systems (MCPA Software Ltd., UK). The advantage of this format to describe a chemical mechanism is that it is simple, and easy to read and modify. A chemical reaction is defined using the following notation:

```
% k : R1 + R2 = P1 + P2 ;
```

where `k` is the rate coefficient, `R1` and `R2` are the reactants, `P1` and `P2` are the products. Chemical reactions can also be written without reactants or products, which is useful to parametrise non-chemical processes in the model, if required. For example, emission of species `P1` can be parametrised as:

```
% Er : = P1 ;
```

where `Er` is the emission rate in s^{-1}. Likewise, dry deposition and dilution of species `R1` can be parametrised, respectively, as:

```
% Vd/BLHEIGHT : R1 = ;
% DILUTE : R1 = ;
```

where `Vd` is the deposition velocity in cm/s, `BLHEIGHT` is the boundary layer height in cm and `DILUTE` is the dilution rate in s^{-1}. `BLHEIGHT` and `DILUTE` are environment variables (Sect. 2.3), and can be set to a value chosen by the user or constrained to prescribed values.

The chemical mechanism file extracted from the MCM website does not need to be modified in order to be used in AtChem. A chemical mechanism different from the MCM can be used, provided that it is in the correct format and it follows the requirements of the MCM. In particular, the calculation of photolysis rates and the sum of organic peroxy radicals (RO_2) must be treated as described in the MCM protocol papers (Jenkin et al., 1997; Saunders et al., 2003). These aspects of the AtChem model are further discussed in Sect. 2.3 and Sect. 2.4.

In order to create the executable file, the chemical mechanism needs to be converted into a format readable by the Fortran compiler, a task performed by a series of Python and shell scripts during the build process (Sect. 2.5). In AtChem-online the conversion is done once the user has uploaded the chemical mechanism file (with the configuration files) to the web server via the Web Interface, while in AtChem2 the user simply needs to execute a shell script and give the name and path of the chemical mechanism file (Fig. 1). The chemical mechanism is the only part of the model that needs to be compiled with the Fortran source code: all the configuration files – inputs, outputs, constraints, model and solver parameters – are read into the model at runtime, meaning that changes in the model configuration do not require the model to be recompiled (Sect. 2.5).

2.3 Variables and constraints

AtChem, and the MCM, have three types of variables:

- Chemical Species: atoms and molecules in the chemical mechanism. The exceptions are CO_2 which, as an end product of VOC oxidation, is not considered by the MCM, and H_2O which is an environment variable (see below); molecular oxygen and nitrogen (O_2 and N_2) are treated as model parameters and their concentrations are calculated from temperature and pressure. A special chemical variable is `RO2`, the sum of all the organic peroxy radicals, which is calculated at runtime by the model using the complete list of organic peroxy radicals in the MCM. `RO2` is a key element of the MCM protocol – an approximation designed to reduce the number of peroxy radical self and cross reactions (Jenkin et al., 1997). The list of organic peroxy radicals can be empty if a mechanism other than the MCM is used, in which case `RO2` has a value of zero.

- Environment Variables: physical characteristics of the model, such as temperature, pressure and solar angles (sun declination, solar zenith angle). Water (H_2O), which can be calculated from relative humidity, is considered an environment variable, not a chemical species. Additional environment variables allow the user to apply a scaling factor to the photolysis rates (`JFAC`, Sect. 2.4) and to use specific parameters for ambient studies (e.g., boundary layer height) or for environmental chamber experiments (e.g., chamber dilution, roof open/closed).

- Photolysis Rates: reaction rates of the photolysis reactions in the chemical mechanism. The treatment of photolysis rates in the model is described in detail in Sect. 2.4.

6

All chemical species, most environment variables and all the photolysis rates can be constrained to prescribed values, such as ambient or chamber measurements. When a variable is constrained, the solver is forced to use its value at each time step to calculate the values of the other variables. The constrained data are stored as simple text files in the corresponding directories.

Constrained box-models are often used to study the chemical processes in a given location (e.g., where a field campaign has taken place) or in a chamber experiment. The rationale behind this modelling approach is that short-lived reactive species are not significantly affected by atmospheric transport or other physical processes. Radical species – such as OH, HO_2, RO_2 and, under certain conditions, NO_3 (Brown et al., 2003; Sommariva et al., 2009) – have lifetimes between a few seconds to a few minutes. Therefore, the *in-situ* concentrations of radicals can be calculated from the measured concentrations of longer-lived species and from the measurements of other parameters (photolysis rates, temperature, pressure, etc.). Hence, the ability of the model to reproduce the observations of radical species is an effective test of the description of atmospheric chemical processes in the model (Eisele et al., 1994; Carslaw et al., 1999). The main problem of this modelling technique is that the datasets of constrained variables are often provided with different time frequencies, depending on the instrument or analytical technique used for the measurement. Some species (e.g., O_3, NO, NO_2) are usually measured once every minute, while others (e.g., most VOC measured by gas chromatography) are typically measured once every 30-60 minutes. Additionally, data from some instruments may be missing for short periods of time, due to operational limitations, calibrations or instrument downtime. A common method to address this issue is to average the constraints to the lowest time frequency available (e.g., 30 minutes). However, this introduces significant uncertainties in the model results and does not allow investigations of the short scale changes in atmospheric composition (Sonderfeld et al., 2016).

An alternative approach is to interpolate the model constraints to fill the gaps and compensate for the different timescales. In AtChem, each constraint is separately interpolated at runtime, using piecewise linear interpolation (piecewise constant interpolation is also available). The advantage of using an interpolation method is that setting up the model is easier and faster, as there is no need to average the constrained data onto a single time base beforehand. More importantly, the constrained data can be used with the original time frequency, thus retaining the important kinetic and mechanistic information that is lost by averaging to the lowest time frequency (Sonderfeld et al., 2016). The disadvantage is that some assumptions are made about the time evolution of the low frequency constraints, which may lead to serious errors if, for example, the gaps in the data are large or the short term variability is high.

The impact of the frequency of the constrained data on the model results was investigated using an AtChem2 model constrained to the measurements of 32 chemical species, 18 photolysis rates and 4 environment variables. The frequencies of the measurements are shown in Table 1. Three model scenarios were used: in all scenarios, methane and C2-C7 hydrocarbons were averaged to 60 minutes, while C1-C4 oxygenated hydrocarbons, CO and H_2 were averaged to 15 minutes. In scenario A, the photolysis rates, the environment variables, and the chemical species O_3, NO, NO_2, SO_2 were averaged to 15 minutes. Scenario B was identical to scenario A, except the photolysis rates were not averaged but used with the original measurement frequency (1 minute). Scenario C was identical to scenario B, except the environment variables and the chemical species O_3, NO, NO_2, SO_2 were not averaged but used with the original measurement frequency (1 minute).

7

215　　The model was run for 9 days, with a 12 hour spin-up period in order to get short-lived intermediates into steady-state: as explained above, AtChem interpolated the constrained data at runtime where necessary. The relative differences between the modelled concentrations of a target species (e.g., OH or HO_2) in each scenario were calculated with Eq. 2:

$$\Delta X_i = \frac{X_i - X_A}{X_A} \tag{2}$$

where X_i is the concentration of the target species in scenario i and X_A is the concentration of the target species in the

220　　reference scenario (A). Scenario A was used as reference because averaging all measured data to 15 minutes is common practice for constrained models; OH and HO_2 were chosen as target species because of their central role in this type of modelling study, as explained above. Figure 2 shows the diurnal distributions of the median relative differences, binned by hour of the day, for the 9-days model run.

　　The model constrained to 1 minute photolysis rates (scenario B) calculated higher concentrations of OH and HO_2 (10-15%

225　　in the morning and ∼5% in the afternoon) compared to the model constrained to 15 minute photolysis rates (scenario A). Increasing the frequency of the chemical species O_3, NO, NO_2, SO_2 and of the environment variables (scenario C) resulted in even larger changes in the calculated concentrations of OH and HO_2 at all times of the day, with variations of up to 20% for OH and up to 15% for HO_2. In both scenarios B and C, the differences in the calculated radical concentrations were higher – up to 40% relative to scenario A – during sunrise and sunset than during the rest of the day (Fig. 2). These periods are critical

230　　for a model from a chemical and mathematical point of view, because they correspond to the sharp changes in the atmospheric chemical processes caused by the photochemical reactions starting and stopping (respectively). These discontinuities typically result in increased stiffness of the ODE system (Sect. 2.6), leading to larger uncertainties in the calculations.

　　Figure 2 shows that the frequency of the constrained variables has a significant effect on the model results, especially during sunrise and sunset. The interpolation of constraints allows the model to use as many high frequency data as are available,

235　　resulting in more precise, if not more accurate, model results. It must be noted that the use of high frequency data as model constraints has the downside of slowing down the integration of the model. For example, the model runtime for scenario C is approximately 20-30% longer than for scenario A. It is up to the user to decide on the balance between model precision and model runtime, depending on the objectives of the modelling work and on the available computing resources.

2.4　Photolysis rates

240　　AtChem implements the parametrisation used by the MCM to calculate the photolysis rates of the appropriate chemical species under clear sky conditions (Jenkin et al., 1997; Saunders et al., 2003). Each photolysis rate (j) is calculated with Eq. 3:

$$j = l \times (cos(\text{SZA}))^m \times e^{(-n \times sec(\text{SZA}))} \times \tau \tag{3}$$

where l, m and n are empirical parameters, SZA is the solar zenith angle and τ is a transmission factor. The empirical parameters l, m, n are calculated, for each version of the MCM, as explained by Jenkin et al. (1997) and Saunders et al.

245 (2003): in the MCM v3.3.1 (and previous versions), the empirical parameters are obtained by fitting Eq. 3 to the output of a two-stream isotropic scattering model, which incorporates the appropriate photolysis cross-sections and quantum yields. The transmission factor τ can be used to account for the loss of natural or artificial light in some environmental chambers caused, for example, by the transmittance of the chamber walls (by default, $\tau = 1$). In AtChem2, the user can customise the photolysis rates parametrisation by providing an alternative file to replace the values of l, m, n and τ provided by the MCM.

250 The solar zenith angle (SZA) is calculated by AtChem from latitude, longitude, day of the year, time of the day and sun declination according to Madronich (1993). The photolysis rates can also be set to constant values, constrained to measured data or constrained to values calculated offline using a suitable radiative transfer model: the flowchart in Fig. 3 shows how AtChem combines constant, calculated and constrained photolysis rates, depending on the model configuration.

A correction factor (JFAC) can be used to account for the difference between the photolysis rates, which are calculated by

255 the model under clear sky conditions, and the measured photolysis rates, which are affected by other environmental factors (e.g., clouds and aerosol). A measured photolysis rate is used as a reference to calculate JFAC using Eq. 4:

$$\text{JFAC} = \frac{j_{meas}}{j_{calc}} \tag{4}$$

where j_{meas} and j_{calc} are the measured and calculated (with the MCM parametrisation) photolysis rates for the reference species, usually NO_2. JFAC, which can also be provided by the user and constrained as an environment variable (Sect. 2.3), is

260 then applied to the other calculated photolysis rates, as shown in Fig. 3.

Figure 4 shows a comparison between the photolysis rates calculated with the MCM parametrisation and measurements of $j(NO_2)$ and $j(O^1D)$ made in different seasons in Boulder, CO (USA). The model correctly calculates the solar angles (sun declination, solar zenith angle, local hour angle and equation of time) and the appropriate diurnal profiles defined by the photolysis cross-section wavelength thresholds, as demonstrated by the correct timing of sunrise, midday and sunset (Figure 4).

265 The calculated values of sun declination and solar zenith angle for the 5 year period 2004-2009 were also double-checked with the online solar calculator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA, https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/grad/solcalc/): the agreement between AtChem and the NOAA tool was within 1%.

On average, the model underestimated the measurements of photolysis rates by 25-30% in all seasons, with slightly better agreement (within 20%) in autumn. The discrepancies between the modelled and measured values may be due to several

270 factors: in particular, the two-stream isotropic scattering model used to derive the empirical parameters in the MCM is run for an altitude of 500 m and a latitude of $45°$ N on July 1 (as described in Jenkin et al. (1997)), while the measurements shown in Fig. 4 were taken at an altitude of $\sim$1700 m and a latitude of $40°$ N in different seasons and years (between 2004 and 2009). Additionally, the model assumes clear sky and ideal environmental conditions, which is often not the case during ambient measurements. The discrepancies between the model and the measurements thus highlight the importance of using measured

275 photolysis rates (if available) and of using JFAC to correct the calculated photolysis rates, as explained above.

2.5 Model configuration

The typical workflow for AtChem2 is shown in Fig. 5: the user downloads the chemical mechanism from the MCM website, prepares the configuration files and chooses the model parameters. For AtChem-online a few extra steps are required, as the user has to upload the model configuration and data to the web server via the Web Interface (Fig. 1). The configuration of AtChem
280 sets the initial conditions, the list of constrained variables, the model start/stop date and time, the latitude and longitude, and the required model outputs. All the model configuration information and data are provided to AtChem in the form of simple text files, which can be prepared and edited with a normal text editor, thus simplifying the setup of the model and eliminating the need to modify the Fortran source code.

Compilation of the AtChem model is done via a series of Python and shell scripts which link together the Fortran source
285 code and the chemical mechanism – after conversion to a Fortran compatible format, as explained in Sect. 2.2 – to create an executable file, called `atchem` (for AtChem-online) or `atchem2` (for AtChem2). The compilation process is performed with a build script, which requires only a basic knowledge of the Unix command-line: the user has to pass to the build script the paths to the chemical mechanism file, to the configuration directory and to the model constraints. The model configuration and constraints are read by the executable at runtime: there is no need to compile the model more than once, unless the chemical
290 mechanism or parts of the source code are modified by the user (Fig. 5). This approach makes it quick and easy to set up batch model runs. With AtChem-online batch model runs are not possible because compilation is automatically performed on the web server when the model run is started: the chemical mechanism, the configuration files and the model constraints have to be uploaded via the Web Interface before every run and the model has to be recompiled every time it is executed, regardless of the changes that the user has made.

2.6 Integration and output
295

An atmospheric chemistry model is essentially a system of coupled ODEs that needs to be solved versus time for a given set of boundary conditions (Sect. 1). AtChem interpolates between the data points of the constrained variables, as explained in Sect. 2.3: the chemical species, the photolysis rates and the environment variables are evaluated by the solver when required and each is interpolated individually during the integration of the ODE system.
300 AtChem uses the CVODE library, which is part of the SUite of Nonlinear and DIfferential/ALgebraic Equation Solvers (SUNDIALS, Hindmarsh et al. (2005)) to integrate the system of differential equations; SUNDIALS is open source, under BSD 3-Clause license, and is available at https://computation.llnl.gov/projects/sundials/. Atmospheric chemical models are usually very stiff: this means they have at least one rapidly-damped mode, corresponding to the short atmospheric lifetimes of some chemical species (of the order of seconds to minutes for the OH, HO_2 and RO_2 radicals) relative to the timescales of the
305 full system (of the order of hours to months). The disparity in timescales results in the stiffness of the underlying ODE system. CVODE uses a multi-step method with variable step-size and variable order to solve this type of stiff system. The solver type, preconditioner, and other solver settings can be tuned by the user, although the default settings should be good enough for most atmospheric chemistry box-models.

AtChem outputs the concentrations of the chemical species, the values of the environment variables, the reaction rates, the
photolysis rates, and the model diagnostic variables. The Jacobian matrix can also be output, if required. Because of the large
number of chemical species in the MCM (over 7000), the output of the calculated concentrations is currently limited to 100
chemical species selected by the user in the model configuration (Sect. 2.5), although this number can be changed by modifying
the Fortran source code.

Reaction rates ($k \times [R1] \times [R2]$, for the generic reaction $R1 + R2 \rightarrow P1 + P2$) are output for all reactions in the chemical
mechanism at a frequency chosen by the user in the model configuration. In addition, the model can calculate and output
the rate of production and destruction for a selected number of species of particular interest. Rate of production/destruction
analyses (ROPA/RODA) of short-lived reactive species are very useful to investigate the chemical budgets and fluxes of species
of particular interest, such as the OH, HO_2, RO_2 and NO_3 radicals (Emmerson et al., 2007; Ren et al., 2008; Elshorbany et al.,
2009; Sommariva et al., 2009; Lu et al., 2012). The ROPA/RODA model output consists of two formatted files with the rate of
formation and loss of a given species for each reaction in which it is present as product or reactant, respectively. The species
for which the calculated concentrations and the rate of production/destruction analysis are required are chosen by the user in
the model configuration, together with the corresponding output frequency (Sect. 2.5).

All output files are simple space-delimited text files, which can be easily imported into external data analysis software for
further processing and plotting. In AtChem2 the output files are saved in a directory specified by the user when the model run
is started, while in AtChem-online the output files have to be downloaded from the web server as a compressed zip file. Simple
plotting tools – in Python, R, MATLAB, gnuplot – allow the user to have a quick look at the model results and at the diagnostic
variables as soon as the model run is completed.

3   Applications of the AtChem model

3.1   Chamber studies

AtChem was originally conceived as a modelling tool for environmental chambers, in order to aid in the characterisation of
the chambers, in the interpretation of the experimental results and in the evaluation/development of the MCM (Sect. 1). We
demonstrate this type of application using data from a propene oxidation experiment conducted in the Chamber for Experi-
mental Multiphase Atmospheric Simulation (CESAM), at the Laboratoire Inter-universitaire des Systèmes Atmosphériques,
near Paris, France (http://www.cesam.cnrs.fr/).

The propene chemical mechanism and the inorganic chemistry scheme were extracted from the MCM v3.3.1 and comple-
mented with an auxiliary mechanism specific to the CESAM chamber, as described in Wang et al. (2011). Chamber-specific
reactions are needed to model this type of experiment so that the background reactivity of the environmental chamber can be
taken into account. This allows the separation of the chamber-specific chemical processes from the underlying processes that
are being studied in the experiments, in order to make the results from experiments carried out in different chambers compara-
ble and transferable to the atmosphere. The chamber-specific mechanism for CESAM includes: chamber dilution, loss of O_3,
and conversion of NO_2 to NO + HONO on the chamber wall, with an initial concentration of HONO of 8 ppbv (Wang et al.,

11

2011). CESAM is an indoor atmospheric simulation chamber and uses three 4 kW Xenon arc lamps as a light source. The photolysis rate of NO_2 was the only photolysis rate measured inside the chamber: during the propene oxidation experiment, when the chamber lamps were on, $j(NO_2)$ was a constant value of 3.5×10^{-3} s^{-1}. The model was constrained to the $j(NO_2)$ measurements, while the remaining photolysis rates were calculated by AtChem using the MCM parametrisation and scaled using the JFAC correction factor (Sect. 2.4).

Figure 6 shows the modelled mixing ratios of the precursor VOC (propene), with the primary oxidation products HCHO and CH_3CHO, the secondary product peroxyacetyl nitrate (PAN, formed via the $OH + CH_3CHO$ reaction), plus the inorganic species NO, NO_2 and O_3. The propene loss began when the chamber lamps were switched on – 1800 seconds after the start of the experiment – and was driven by reaction with OH, produced from HONO photolysis. HONO was formed in the chamber from heterogeneous chemistry occurring on the chamber wall; its role in initiating the oxidation of propene demonstrates that it is essential to understand, and include in the model, the chamber-specific chemical mechanism. The model showed good agreement with the observations of propene, NO, NO_2 and CH_3CHO, with a tendency to overestimate HCHO and underestimate O_3 and PAN in the latter stage of the experiment (Fig. 6), which may hint at potential problems with the chemistry of the oxidation products of propene in the MCM and/or with the chamber auxiliary mechanism. Such experiments can be used to refine and optimise the chamber-specific mechanisms, but, overall, the model results indicate that the MCM is reasonably accurate in its description of the gas-phase oxidation of propene in the troposphere.

3.2 Field studies

The chamber experiment and the corresponding model simulation shown in Sect. 3.1 are relatively simple: the chemical mechanism only had 83 species and 261 reactions, the model was unconstrained (except for $j(NO_2)$) and the duration of the experiment was less than 2 hours. Intensive field campaigns typically last for several days or weeks and the chemical mechanism needed for a campaign model is usually much larger than the one needed for a chamber model. It is not unusual for a campaign model to use the entire MCM (>17000 chemical reactions), along with a hundred or more constrained variables. This makes the model computationally very expensive and difficult to run on a web application, such as AtChem-online.

AtChem2 was developed specifically for the long and complex simulations needed for field studies. We demonstrate this type of application using the dataset of the Texas Air Quality Study 2006, an intensive ship-based field campaign on the Gulf Coast of the United States (Parrish et al., 2009). The cruise took place between 27 July and 11 September 2006 on the NOAA research vessel *Ronald H. Brown*; the radical measurements (total peroxy radicals and NO_3) and the corresponding modelling study are discussed in Sommariva et al. (2011a). In that work, the model showed reasonably good agreement with the measured concentrations of total peroxy radicals (within $\sim$30%, on average), although it underestimated the measurements of NO_3 by approximately a factor of 3.

The chemical mechanism used here was extracted from the MCM v3.1 (as in Sommariva et al. (2011a)): it included the inorganic chemistry scheme, the oxidation mechanism of 65 VOC, the dimethyl sulfide (DMS) oxidation mechanism from Sommariva et al. (2009), plus dry deposition terms and heterogeneous reactions for the appropriate gas-phase species. The model constraints – CO, CH_4, H_2, NO, NO_2, O_3, SO_2, H_2O, 65 VOC, $j(O^1D)$, $j(NO_2)$, $j(NO_3)$, aerosol surface area,

temperature, pressure, latitude and longitude – and configuration were the same as in the model described by Sommariva et al. (2011a).

The modelled concentrations of total peroxy radicals (HO_2+RO_2) for the period July 31-August 2 are shown in Fig. 7, together with the corresponding measurements. The results obtained with version 1 of AtChem2 and with the beta version of AtChem used by Sommariva et al. (2011a) differ by $\sim$3% – a discrepancy due to a small bug in the calculation of JFAC which was fixed in a later version of AtChem. During the day, the model overestimated the measured concentrations of HO_2+RO_2 by 10-25%, which is well within the instrumental uncertainty ($\sim$40%). During the night, the model underestimated the measurements of HO_2+RO_2 by up to 57%, although the disagreement between the model and the measurements at nighttime during the entire cruise was on average lower (25-30%, Sommariva et al. (2011a)). The ability of the model to reproduce the observations of total peroxy radicals provides useful insight into the chemical processes in the marine boundary layer: the model-measurements discrepancies indicate that, under unpolluted conditions, radical chemistry is much better understood during the day than during the night, which suggests that future studies should focus on nocturnal chemistry.

The ROPA/RODA model output (Sect. 2.6) can be used to investigate the details of the chemical processes in the unpolluted marine atmosphere encountered during the first few days of TexAQS 2006. The model results indicate that, in that period, the methyl peroxy radical (CH_3O_2) was the major component of the RO_2 pool (30-45% during the day, 50-80% during the night). Figure 8 shows the rates of production and destruction of CH_3O_2 at midday and midnight of August 1, when the ship was in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Florida. The main destruction term for CH_3O_2 was the reaction with NO, even though the levels of nitrogen oxides were low during the first few days of the cruise ($<$1 ppbv, on average). The reactions of CH_3O_2 with HO_2 and RO_2 accounted together for about half of the total CH_3O_2 loss at midday, but for only $\sim$15% at midnight, because of the very low nocturnal concentrations of peroxy radicals. It must be noted, however, that since the model underestimated the concentrations of HO_2 and RO_2 during the night (Fig. 7), their role as CH_3O_2 sinks was also underestimated.

The oxidation of methane and the reactions of the acetyl peroxy radical – CH_3CO_3, typically formed from the oxidation of C2-C5 hydrocarbons – with NO and other peroxy radicals were the major sources of CH_3O_2. During the day, the oxidation of carbonyls and of organic acids was a significant contributor to the formation of CH_3O_2; at night, methane oxidation was driven by OH radicals formed by the ozonolysis of alkenes, while DMS oxidation (mostly via reaction with NO_3, Sommariva et al. (2011a)) accounted for up to a third of the total CH_3O_2 production. The formation pathways of the methyl peroxy radical in the unpolluted marine atmosphere highlight the different chemical processes taking place during the day, when OH photochemistry dominates, and during the night, when reactions initiated by NO_3 and O_3 become an important source of short-chain organic peroxy radicals.

4   Summary and future work

AtChem provides a tool to model atmospheric chemical processes that is free, open source, quick to set up and easy to use. Semi-automated scripts and simple text files allow the user to install, configure and run an atmospheric chemistry box-model even with little modelling experience. A particular strength of AtChem is the ease with which models can be constrained

to measured data and the facility to use constraints with different timescales, a feature that allows the user to exploit all the information contained in the measurements and greatly decreases the time needed to prepare and pre-process the model constraints. Another important component of AtChem is the implementation of a continuous integration workflow, which – together with a comprehensive suite of tests and version control software – allows the model results to be verified against known solutions, as well as to track and record all the modifications to the code. This ensures that changes to the AtChem codebase are fully documented and do not cause unintended behaviour, thus making AtChem robust, reliable and traceable. Although primarily designed for the MCM, AtChem can be easily adapted to use any other chemical mechanism, as long as it is provided in the correct format.

There are two versions of AtChem available: AtChem-online runs as a web application (https://atchem.leeds.ac.uk/webapp/) and is suitable for relatively simple simulations, such as laboratory and environmental chamber experiments. AtChem2 is a development of AtChem-online designed to run more complex and longer simulations, such as ambient measurements and field campaigns, and to facilitate batch simulations for sensitivity studies. AtChem2 is available at https://github.com/AtChem/, under the open source MIT license. We have demonstrated the capabilities of AtChem to model chamber experiments and field studies with examples taken from the EUROCHAMP database and the NOAA TexAQS 2006 field campaign, respectively.

Future work and development plans for AtChem2 include:

– Implementation of a system to read the chemical mechanism at runtime, which will eliminate the need to recompile the executable more than once (unless the underlying Fortran source code is modified) and further simplify batch model runs.

– Expansion of the test suite and detailed profiling of the code at runtime to identify and streamline bottlenecks and make the model faster to run.

– Simplification of the model configuration and output, and addition of different formats for the chemical mechanism, such as the format used by the open source modelling software KPP (Damian et al., 2002).

In addition, AtChem-online needs to be upgraded to the AtChem2 codebase with a new and improved Web Interface. A more simple version of the upgraded AtChem-online may also be developed for educational and outreach purposes: this version should feature a basic user interface, simplified configuration options and more intuitive visualisation tools.

References

Abbatt, J., George, C., Melamed, M., Monks, P., Pandis, S., and Rudich, Y.: Fundamentals of atmospheric chemistry: keeping a three-legged stool balanced, Atmos. Environ., 84, 390–391, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.10.025, 2014.

Bloss, C., Wagner, V., Bonzanini, A., Jenkin, M. E., Wirtz, K., Martin-Reviejo, M., and Pilling, M. J.: Evaluation of detailed aromatic mechanisms (MCMv3 and MCMv3.1) against environmental chamber data, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 623–639, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-5-623-2005, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/5/623/2005/, 2005a.

Bloss, C., Wagner, V., Jenkin, M. E., Volkamer, R., Bloss, W. J., Lee, J. D., Heard, D. E., Wirtz, K., Martin-Reviejo, M., Rea, G., Wenger, J. C., and Pilling, M. J.: Development of a detailed chemical mechanism (MCMv3.1) for the atmospheric oxidation of aromatic hydrocarbons, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 641–664, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-5-641-2005, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/5/641/2005/, 2005b.

Bonet, F. J., Pérez-Pérez, R., Benito, B. M., de Albuquerque, F. S., and Zamora, R.: Documenting, storing, and executing models in ecology: a conceptual framework and real implementation in a global change monitoring program, Environ. Modell. Software, 52, 192–199, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.10.027, 2014.

Brauers, T., Hausmann, M., Bister, A., Kraus, A., and Dorn, H.-P.: OH radicals in the boundary layer of the Atlantic Ocean: 1. Measurements by long-path laser absorption spectroscopy, J. Geophys. Res., 106, 7399–7414, https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD900679, 2001.

Brown, S. S., Stark, H., and Ravishankara, A. R.: Applicability of the steady state approximation to the interpretation of atmospheric observations of NO3 and N2O5, J. Geophys. Res., 108, 4539, https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JD003407, 2003.

Brune, W. H., Baier, B. C., Thomas, J., Ren, X., Cohen, R. C., Pusede, S. E., Browne, E. C., Goldstein, A. H., Gentner, D. R., Keutsch, F. N., Thornton, J. A., Harrold, S., Lopez-Hilfiker, F. D., and Wennberg, P. O.: Ozone production chemistry in the presence of urban plumes, Faraday Discuss., 189, 169–189, https://doi.org/10.1039/C5FD00204D, 2016.

Burkholder, J. B., Abbatt, J. P. D., Barnes, I., Roberts, J. M., Melamed, M. L., Ammann, M., Bertram, A. K., Cappa, C. D., Carlton, A. G., Carpenter, L. J., Crowley, J. N., Dubowski, Y., George, C., Heard, D. E., Herrmann, H., Keutsch, F. N., Kroll, J. H., McNeill, V. F., Ng, N. L., Nizkorodov, S. A., Orlando, J. J., Percival, C. J., Picquet-Varrault, B., Rudich, Y., Seakins, P. W., Surratt, J. D., Tanimoto, H., Thornton, J. A., Tong, Z., Tyndall, G. S., Wahner, A., Weschler, C. J., Wilson, K. R., and Ziemann, P. J.: The essential role for laboratory studies in atmospheric chemistry, Environ. Sci. Technol., 51, 2519–2528, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b04947, 2017.

Carslaw, N., Creasey, D. J., Heard, D. E., Lewis, A. C., McQuaid, J. B., Pilling, M. J., Monks, P. S., Bandy, B. J., and Penkett, S. A.: Modeling OH, HO2, and RO2 radicals in the marine boundary layer: 1. Model construction and comparison with field measurements, J. Geophys. Res., 104, 30 241–30 255, https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JD900783, 1999.

Carter, W. P. L.: Computer modeling of environmental chamber measurements of maximum incremental reactivities of volatile organic compounds, Atmos. Environ., 29, 2513–2527, https://doi.org/10.1016/1352-2310(95)00150-W, 1995.

Chen, G., Huey, L. G., Trainer, M., Nicks, D., Corbett, J., Ryerson, T., Parrish, D., Neuman, J. A., Nowak, J., Tanner, D., Holloway, J., Brock, C., Crawford, J., Olson, J. R., Sullivan, A., Weber, R., Schauffler, S., Donnelly, S., Atlas, E., Roberts, J., Flocke, F., Hübler, G., and Fehsenfeld, F.: An investigation of the chemistry of ship emission plumes during ITCT 2002, J. Geophys. Res., 110, D10S90, https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JD005236, 2005.

Chen, S., Ren, X., Mao, J., Chen, Z., Brune, W. H., Lefer, B., Rappenglück, B., Flynn, J., Olson, J., and Crawford, J. H.: A comparison of chemical mechanisms based on TRAMP-2006 field data, Atmos. Environ., 44, 4116–4125, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.05.027, 2010.

Chen, Y., Sexton, K. G., Jerry, R. E., Surratt, J. D., and Vizuete, W.: Assessment of SAPRC07 with updated isoprene chemistry against outdoor chamber experiments, Atmos. Environ., 105, 109–120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.01.042, 2015.

Curtis, A. R. and Sweetenham, W. P.: FACSIMILE/CHECKMAT user's manual, Tech. rep., AEA Technology, Harwell, UK, 1987.

Damian, V., Sandu, A., Damian, M., Potra, F., and Carmichael, G. R.: The kinetic preprocessor KPP – a software environment for solving chemical kinetics, Comput. Chem. Eng., 26, 1567–1579, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-1354(02)00128-X, 2002.

Derwent, R. G., Jenkin, M. E., Saunders, S. M., and Pilling, M. J.: Photochemical ozone creation potentials for organic compounds in northwest Europe calculated with a Master Chemical Mechanism, Atmos. Environ., 32, 2429–2441, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(98)00053-3, 1998.

Derwent, R. G., Jenkin, M. E., Saunders, S. M., Pilling, M. J., Simmonds, P. G., Passant, N. R., Dollard, G. J., Dumitrean, P., and Kent, A.: Photochemical ozone formation in north west Europe and its control, Atmos. Environ., 37, 1983–1991, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(03)00031-1, 2003.

Edwards, P. M., Brown, S. S., Roberts, J. M., Ahmadov, R., Banta, R. M., de Gouw, J. A., Dubé, W. P., Field, R. A., Flynn, J. H., Gilman, J. B., Graus, M., Helmig, D., Koss, A., Langford, A. O., Lefer, B. L., Lerner, B. M., Li, R., Li, S.-M., McKeen, S. A., Murphy, S. M., Parrish, D. D., Senff, C. J., Soltis, J., Stutz, J., Sweeney, C., Thompson, C. R., Trainer, M. K., Tsai, C., Veres, P. R., Washenfelder, R. A., Warneke, C., Wild, R. J., Young, C. J., Yuan, B., and Zamora, R.: High winter ozone pollution from carbonyl photolysis in an oil and gas basin, Nature, 514, 351–354, https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13767, 2014.

Eisele, F. L., Mount, G. H., Fehsenfeld, F. C., Harder, J., Marovich, E., Parrish, D. D., Roberts, J., Trainer, M., and Tanner, D.: Intercomparison of tropospheric OH and ancillary trace gas measurements at Fritz Peak Observatory, Colorado, J. Geophys. Res., 99, 18 605, https://doi.org/10.1029/94JD00740, 1994.

Elshorbany, Y. F., Kurtenbach, R., Wiesen, P., Lissi, E., Rubio, M., Villena, G., Gramsch, E., Rickard, A. R., Pilling, M. J., and Kleffmann, J.: Oxidation capacity of the city air of Santiago, Chile, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 2257–2273, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-2257-2009, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/9/2257/2009/, 2009.

Emmerson, K. M. and Evans, M. J.: Comparison of tropospheric gas-phase chemistry schemes for use within global models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 1831–1845, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-1831-2009, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/9/1831/2009/, 2009.

Emmerson, K. M., Carslaw, N., Carslaw, D. C., Lee, J. D., McFiggans, G., Bloss, W. J., Gravestock, T., Heard, D. E., Hopkins, J., Ingham, T., Pilling, M. J., Smith, S. C., Jacob, M., and Monks, P. S.: Free radical modelling studies during the UK TORCH campaign in summer 2003, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 167–181, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-167-2007, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/7/167/2007/, 2007.

Hindmarsh, A. C., Brown, P. N., Grant, K. E., Lee, S. L., Serban, R., Shumaker, D. E., and Woodward, C. S.: SUNDIALS: suite of nonlinear and differential/algebraic equation solvers, ACM Trans. Math. Software, 31, 363–396, https://doi.org/10.1145/1089014.1089020, 2005.

Ince, D. C., Hatton, L., and Graham-Cumming, J.: The case for open computer programs, Nature, 482, 485–488, https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10836, 2012.

Jenkin, M. E., Saunders, S. M., and Pilling, M. J.: The tropospheric degradation of volatile organic compounds: a protocol for mechanism development, Atmos. Environ., 31, 81–104, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(96)00105-7, 1997.

Jenkin, M. E., Saunders, S. M., Derwent, R. G., and Pilling, M. J.: Development of a reduced speciated VOC degradation mechanism for use in ozone models, Atmos. Environ., 36, 4725–4734, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(02)00563-0, 2002.

Jenkin, M. E., Saunders, S. M., Wagner, V., and Pilling, M. J.: Protocol for the development of the Master Chemical Mechanism, MCM v3 (Part B): tropospheric degradation of aromatic volatile organic compounds, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 3, 181–193, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-3-181-2003, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/3/181/2003/, 2003.

Jenkin, M. E., Young, J. C., and Rickard, A. R.: The MCM v3.3.1 degradation scheme for isoprene, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 11 433–11 459, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-11433-2015, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/15/11433/2015/, 2015.

Jenkin, M. E., Khan, M. A. H., Shallcross, D. E., Bergström, R., Simpson, D., Murphy, K. L. C., and Rickard, A. R.: The CRI v2.2 reduced degradation scheme for isoprene, Atmos. Environ., 212, 172–182, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.05.055, 2019.

Knote, C., Tuccella, P., Curci, G., Emmons, L., Orlando, J. J., Madronich, S., Baró, R., Jiménez-Guerrero, P., Luecken, D., Hogrefe, C., Forkel, R., Werhahn, J., Hirtl, M., Pérez, J. L., José, R. S., Giordano, L., Brunner, D., Yahya, K., and Zhang, Y.: Influence of the choice of gas-phase mechanism on predictions of key gaseous pollutants during the AQMEII phase-2 intercomparison, Atmos. Environ., 115, 553–568, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.11.066, 2015.

Lu, K. D., Rohrer, F., Holland, F., Fuchs, H., Bohn, B., Brauers, T., Chang, C. C., Häseler, R., Hu, M., Kita, K., Kondo, Y., Li, X., Lou, S. R., Nehr, S., Shao, M., Zeng, L. M., Wahner, A., Zhang, Y. H., and Hofzumahaus, A.: Observation and modelling of OH and HO2 concentrations in the Pearl River Delta 2006: a missing OH source in a VOC rich atmosphere, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 1541–1569, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-1541-2012, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/12/1541/2012/, 2012.

Madronich, S.: The atmosphere and UV-B radiation at ground level, in: Environmental UV Photobiology, edited by Young, A. R., Moan, J., Björn, L. O., and Nultsch, W., pp. 1–39, Springer, Boston, MA, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2406-3_1, 1993.

Madronich, S.: Chemical evolution of gaseous air pollutants down-wind of tropical megacities: Mexico City case study, Atmos. Environ., 40, 6012–6018, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.08.047, 2006.

Metzger, A., Dommen, J., Gaeggeler, K., Duplissy, J., Prevot, A. S. H., Kleffmann, J., Elshorbany, Y., Wisthaler, A., and Baltensperger, U.: Evaluation of 1,3,5 trimethylbenzene degradation in the detailed tropospheric chemistry mechanism, MCMv3.1, using environmental chamber data, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 6453–6468, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-6453-2008, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/8/6453/2008/, 2008.

Novelli, A., Kaminski, M., Rolletter, M., Acir, I.-H., Bohn, B., Dorn, H.-P., Li, X., Lutz, A., Nehr, S., Rohrer, F., Tillmann, R., Wegener, R., Holland, F., Hofzumahaus, A., Kiendler-Scharr, A., Wahner, A., and Fuchs, H.: Evaluation of OH and HO2 concentrations and their budgets during photooxidation of 2-methyl-3-butene-2-ol (MBO) in the atmospheric simulation chamber SAPHIR, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 11 409–11 422, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-11409-2018, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/18/11409/2018/, 2018.

Parrish, D. D., Allen, D. T., Bates, T. S., Estes, M., Fehsenfeld, F. C., Feingold, G., Ferrare, R., Hardesty, R. M., Meagher, J. F., Nielsen-Gammon, J. W., Pierce, R. B., Ryerson, T. B., Seinfeld, J. H., and Williams, E. J.: Overview of the Second Texas Air Quality Study (TEXAQS II) and the Gulf of Mexico Atmospheric Composition and Climate Study (GOMACCS), J. Geophys. Res., 114, https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD011842, 2009.

Ren, X., Olson, J. R., Crawford, J. H., Brune, W. H., Mao, J., Long, R. B., Chen, Z., Chen, G., Avery, M. A., Sachse, G. W., Barrick, J. D., Diskin, G. S., Huey, L. G., Fried, A., Cohen, R. C., Heikes, B., Wennberg, P. O., Singh, H. B., Blake, D. R., and Shetter, R. E.: HOx chemistry during INTEX-A 2004: observation, model calculation, and comparison with previous studies, J. Geophys. Res., 113, https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009166, 2008.

Roberts, J. M., Marchewka, M., Bertman, S. B., Sommariva, R., Warneke, C., de Gouw, J., Kuster, W., Goldan, P., Williams, E., Lerner, B. M., Murphy, P., and Fehsenfeld, F. C.: Measurements of PANs during the New England Air Quality Study 2002, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D20306, https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD008667, 11, 2007.

Sander, R., Baumgaertner, A., Gromov, S., Harder, H., Jöckel, P., Kerkweg, A., Kubistin, D., Regelin, E., Riede, H., Sandu, A., Taraborrelli, D., Tost, H., and Xie, Z.-Q.: The atmospheric chemistry box model CAABA/MECCA-3.0, Geosci. Model Dev., 4, 373–380, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-4-373-2011, 2011.

560   Saunders, S. M., Jenkin, M. E., Derwent, R. G., and Pilling, M. J.: Protocol for the development of the Master Chemical Mechanism, MCM v3 (Part A): tropospheric degradation of non-aromatic volatile organic compounds, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 3, 161–180, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-3-161-2003, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/3/161/2003/, 2003.

     Shamir, L., Wallin, J. F., Allen, A., Berriman, B., Teuben, P., Nemiroff, R. J., Mink, J., Hanisch, R. J., and DuPrie, K.: Practices in source code sharing in astrophysics, Astron. Comput., 1, 54–58, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ascom.2013.04.001, 2013.

565   Sommariva, R., Trainer, M., de Gouw, J. A., Roberts, J. M., Warneke, C., Atlas, E., Flocke, F., Goldan, P. D., Kuster, W. C., Swanson, A. L., and Fehsenfeld, F. C.: A study of organic nitrates formation in an urban plume using a Master Chemical Mechanism, Atmos. Environ., 42, 5771–5786, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2007.12.031, 12, 2008.

     Sommariva, R., Osthoff, H. D., Brown, S. S., Bates, T. S., Baynard, T., Coffman, D., de Gouw, J. A., Goldan, P. D., Kuster, W. C., Lerner, B. M., Stark, H., Warneke, C., Williams, E. J., Fehsenfeld, F. C., Ravishankara, A. R., and Trainer, M.: Radicals in the marine
570   boundary layer during NEAQS 2004: a model study of day-time and night-time sources and sinks, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 3075–3093, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-9-3075-2009, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/9/3075/2009/, 16, 2009.

     Sommariva, R., Bates, T. S., Bon, D., Brookes, D. M., de Gouw, J. A., Gilman, J. B., Herndon, S. C., Kuster, W. C., Lerner, B. M., Monks, P. S., Osthoff, H. D., Parker, A. E., Roberts, J. M., Tucker, S. C., Warneke, C., Williams, E. J., Zahniser, M. S., and Brown, S. S.: Modelled and measured concentrations of peroxy radicals and nitrate radical in the U.S. Gulf Coast region during TexAQS 2006, J. Atmos. Chem.,
575   68, 331–362, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10874-012-9224-7, 20, 2011a.

     Sommariva, R., de Gouw, J. A., Trainer, M., Atlas, E., Goldan, P. D., Kuster, W. C., Warneke, C., and Fehsenfeld, F. C.: Emissions and photochemistry of oxygenated VOCs in urban plumes in the Northeastern United States, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 7081–7096, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-7081-2011, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/11/7081/2011/, 19, 2011b.

     Sonderfeld, H., White, I. R., Goodall, I. C. A., Hopkins, J. R., Lewis, A. C., Koppmann, R., and Monks, P. S.: What effect does VOC
580   sampling time have on derived OH reactivity?, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 6303–6318, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-6303-2016, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/16/6303/2016/, 2016.

     Topping, D., Connolly, P., and Reid, J.: PyBox: an automated box-model generator for atmospheric chemistry and aerosol simulations., J. Open Source Software, 3, 755, https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00755, 2018.

     Wang, J., Doussin, J. F., Perrier, S., Perraudin, E., Katrib, Y., Pangui, E., and Picquet-Varrault, B.: Design of a new multi-phase exper-
585   imental simulation chamber for atmospheric photosmog, aerosol and cloud chemistry research, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 4, 2465–2494, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-4-2465-2011, https://www.atmos-meas-tech.net/4/2465/2011/, 2011.

     Whalley, L. K., Stone, D., Bandy, B., Dunmore, R., Hamilton, J. F., Hopkins, J., Lee, J. D., Lewis, A. C., and Heard, D. E.: Atmospheric OH reactivity in central London: observations, model predictions and estimates of in situ ozone production, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 2109–2122, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-2109-2016, https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/16/2109/2016/, 2016.

590   Wolfe, G. M., Marvin, M. R., Roberts, S. J., Travis, K. R., and Liao, J.: The Framework for 0-D Atmospheric Modeling (F0AM) v3.1, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 3309–3319, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3309-2016, https://www.geosci-model-dev.net/9/3309/2016/, 2016.

Figure 1. Structure of the AtChem model. The dashed lines indicate the model components that are present in AtChem-online, but not in AtChem2.

Figure 2. Diurnal distributions of the relative differences in the calculated concentrations of OH and HO_2 in scenario B and C compared to scenario A (Table 1) over a 9-days model run. The box-and-whiskers show the medians, and the 1st and 3rd quartiles, while the open circles indicate the outliers.

Figure 3. Treatment of photolysis rates in AtChem.

Figure 4. Average modelled and measured $j(NO_2)$ and $j(O^1D)$ during different seasons in Boulder, CO (USA). The shaded areas are the 95% confidence intervals of the mean. The timestamp is in Greenwich Mean Time, which is the timezone used by AtChem (local time is GMT-7 from November to February and GMT-6 from March to October).

23

Figure 5. Workflow of the AtChem2 model.

Figure 6. Measured (points) and modelled (lines) mixing ratios of propene (C_3H_6), ozone (O_3), nitrogen oxides (NO, NO_2) and propene oxidation products (HCHO, CH_3CHO, PAN) during a propene oxidation experiment at the CESAM atmospheric simulation chamber.

Figure 7. Measured and modelled concentrations of total peroxy radicals (HO_2+RO_2) between July 31 and August 2, during the TexAQS 2006 cruise of the NOAA research vessel *Ronald H. Brown*.

Figure 8. Rate of production (ROPA) and destruction (RODA) analysis of the methyl peroxy radical (CH_3O_2) at midday and midnight of August 1, during the TexAQS 2006 cruise of the NOAA research vessel *Ronald H. Brown*.

Table 1. Frequencies of the original measurements and averaged frequencies of the constrained data used in each model scenario.

Constraint	Measurements Frequency (min)	Constraints Frequency (min)		
		Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
Photolysis Rates	1	15	1	1
Environment Variables §	1	15	15	1
O_3, NO, NO_2, SO_2	1	15	15	1
CO, H_2	5	15	15	15
CH_4	20	60	60	60
VOC (PTR-MS) †	2	15	15	15
VOC (GC-MS) ‡	60	60	60	60

§ temperature, pressure, relative humidity, sun declination.

† C1-C4 oxygenated hydrocarbons.

‡ C2-C7 hydrocarbons.