

***Interactive comment on “An overview of the MILAGRO 2006 campaign: Mexico City emissions and their transport and transformation” by L. T. Molina et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 23 May 2010

The paper ‘An overview of the MILAGRO 2006 campaign: Mexico City emissions and their transport and transformation’ by L.T. Molina, et al. is an overview of findings from the MILAGRO field campaign. However, it is not just a ‘paper about papers’ but also provides some further analysis and attempts to extract the most important results.

It is very well written and is well balanced between the different topics, such as experimental design, emissions, photochemistry, radiation, and transport. It definitely deserves to be published and is a valuable contribution to the ACP journal.

The only weakness of the paper is its length. It is true that some of the chapters can be regarded as stand-alone documents, and it is thus not necessary to read the whole

C3046

paper. However, it is my belief that the main purpose of the paper (overview of the MILAGRO project, road map to its numerous publications, bringing across the main messages) could have been achieved on less pages, e.g. by omitting some details and rather refer the reader to one or more of the MILAGRO publications. It is difficult to point specifically to omissible sentences as they are rather spread throughout the paper, but I recommend making one more effort to shorten the paper at least somewhat, in order to make it more readily accessible.

One more general remark: What about calling Section 12 ‘Summary and Conclusions’ and Section 13 ‘Future work’ in order to better reflect their content.

Minor comments:

p.7823, lines 23-25: add already here how many partners, from which countries, duration and funding agencies

p.7824, line 23: facilitates -> facilitate

p.7826, line 14: remove colon after ‘showing that’

p.7827, lines 17-25: don’t need to name here all conferences and media, can be shortened (while keeping the link to the website).

p.7827, line 26 and onwards: this should be in the introduction.

p.7829, line 24 and onwards: this is what I suggest to include in the introduction (see first minor comment above)

p.7833, line 12: ‘and more’ -> ‘and a more’

p.7848, line 25: remove ‘is’

p.7850, line 13: ‘constrains’ -> ‘constraints’, line 19: comma around ‘respectively’

p.7853, lines 2 and 3: write ‘the UC Irvine group’ and ‘T0 and T1 sites’.

p.7854, line 11: ‘were’ -> ‘was’

C3047

p.7864, line 1: remove 'reflects the partitioning between OH and HO<sub>2</sub>, and'

p.7865, line 12: you mean 'early afternoon'? (as opposed to late afternoon which is VOC limited)

p.7870, line 18: 'composition' -> 'compositions', and: PMcoarse is shown, not PM<sub>2.5</sub>

p.7887, line 1: 'leads' -> 'lead'

p.7888, line 2: move 'were' to after 'aerosols'

p.7890: The sentences in lines 12 and 18, referring to Hodzic et al., 2009, Mugica et al., 2009, and Christian et al., 2010, are very similar. Combine.

p.7892, line 5: 'Previous work' refers to the past, and 'will' to the future. Rather write 'missed', or, e.g., 'the method used in previous work . . . did not detect'

p.7903, line 23: move comma after 'NO' to after the parenthesis. Line 24: factor of 1.4 to 1.9?

Fig.3: 'except MCM-2006'? So why is it included in the figure? Mention that the measurements were performed in the Mexico City basin, or refer to section 3.1 or Fig.4.

Fig.5: '9 March' -> '9 March 2006'

Fig.6, NO<sub>x</sub>, don't private cars include any Diesel vehicles?

Fig.7: 'insert' -> 'inset'

Fig.9: 'at T0' -> 'at the supersites T0'

Fig.10: '19 March' -> '19 March 2006' In the text replace 'Fig.' with 'Figure'

Fig. 11: I don't see the 'Modeling Domain'. Guess it's the whole figure, so the red box in the legend can be omitted. Furthermore, the figure has rather poor print quality.

Fig.13: 'March 15' -> 'March 15, 2006'

---

C3048

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 7819, 2010.

C3049