

Interactive comment on “Comparison of global inventories of monthly CO emissions derived from remotely sensed data” by D. Stroppiana et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 28 August 2010

This paper compares five global inventories of CO emissions from biomass burning and reports large global and continental differences between them. A strength of the paper is that the five inventories indeed use very different approaches, making for an interesting comparison. A weakness is that the comparison does not go much beyond a simple description of the differences. Little insight is given into the causes of the differences as a guide for reducing uncertainties in the future. This paper will provide a useful reference as statement on the uncertainty in biomass burning emissions; aside for that, I don't see it contributing much to resolving the problem. Also the writing has many grammatical and stylistic mistakes. I rate this paper “not great but publishable”.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

A few specific comments:

1. Title should mention that the comparison is for biomass burning emissions.
2. A number of global biomass burning inventories for CO have been published, and citing those inventories along with perhaps their global numbers would provide broader context for this paper. The Bian et al. JGR 2007 paper discussing the effect of uncertainty in biomass burning inventories on global CO models is probably of relevance.
3. GFED3 has now been released and comparison to GFED2 should at least be discussed.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 17657, 2010.

ACPD

10, C6916–C6917, 2010

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C6917

