

Interactive comment on “The EMEP MSC-W chemical transport model – Part 1: Model description” by D. Simpson et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 3 April 2012

This paper provides a description of a new version of the EMEP model. The model is described in detail. I can find no serious errors in the paper. However, the paper is purely a description of the model and does not include any “science”. That is, the paper does not address relevant scientific questions or reach any substantial conclusions. Model evaluation is left for a second paper. Therefore whilst the paper will be of great interest to the atmospheric modelling community and would act as a very useful reference to the EMEP model the paper does not seem to be strictly within scope of ACP. As written, it is my opinion that the paper would be more suited to a journal such as GMD.

Minor comments

P3782, L8 and P3783, L15: Should this be “50 x 50 km”, not “50 x 50 km²”. Same

C1241

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



comment applies at several other places e.g. P3784, L5; P3785, L7; P2785, L10

P3783, L14-L17: These 4 lines are a direct repeat of the abstract.

P3787, L2-4. Can you provide a reference to support this statement?

P3788, L8. “eta”?

P3808, L10. Please clarify what you mean that “DMS emissions are treated as SO₂ on input to the calculations”

P3808, L12. What emissions data for volcanoes do you use?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 3781, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper