

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Spatial and temporal variations in ammonia emissions – a freely accessible model code for Europe” by C. A. Skjøth et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 18 March 2011

This manuscript describes an method for developing ammonia emissions that includes improved temporal and spatial variability. This is an important need, and merits publication in Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics.

I do believe that the paper could benefit from a more balanced presentation of the results. I suggest the authors address these issues before publication in ACP.

- Page 2135 describes that the correlation between the simulated  $\text{NH}_3$  and measurements improves at all sites. It is also true that the bias increases at most sites. Please discuss why the correlation is improved, but the bias is not.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

- Because there are large seasonal variability, it would be best to report the bias metrics normalized by the mean, as a percentage rather than an absolute amount.
- On page 2136, the results of Figure 11 are discussed and compared to the results in Table 3. I find it very difficult to reconcile these data. In Table 3, Langenbrügge with the new emissions has a more negative bias and an improved correlation. In Figure 11, it seems the ammonia concentration increases considerably at this site, causing large divergence from the 1:1 line. How can these both be correct? Are these points to the right outliers? It would be possible to interpret if the authors used a box plot rather than a scatter plot with so many overlapping points.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 2123, 2011.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)