

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Nitrogen deposition to the United States: distribution, sources, and processes” by L. Zhang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 February 2012

Nitrogen deposition in the environment is a relevant and important topic. This paper examines nitrogen fluxes, concentrations, and distributions in the US using a global computer simulation of atmospheric chemistry and transport (GEOS-Chem). The motivation, methods and assumptions are clearly set out, and overall the model does a reasonable job representing the processes involved. The resulting calculated fluxes and concentrations compare well with a suite of appropriate observations from a variety of sources, as well as with previous modelling efforts. Although there are some limitations (which the authors identify), this is a competent synthesis of the current state of knowledge on this issue. This work is relevant to the scope of ACP. The paper is nicely written and presented, and well structured. I fully recommend publication in ACP, after addressing the minor clarifications mentioned subsequently.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive Comment

Line 13, p 250. “The model does not capture the observed high values of wet deposition in the upper Midwest...”. The authors attribute this to a regional underestimate of emissions from the agricultural upper Midwest. Is it possible that some of the discrepancy is a result of scaling factors applied derived from observations from the eastern US? Presumably this will be refined in subsequent publications. Another interesting thought is that the slightly high ammonium concentrations (e.g. Fig. 5) could be allowing more nitrate to reside in particles, thus adding to the overestimate of nitrate already present due to overly efficient N₂O₅ hydrolysis.

Line 18, p 248. The reference used for the temperature dependence (Aneja et al., 2000) states that emission is greater in summer than winter, but that is opposite to what is found in the simulations with no applied scaling factors here, which is a little confusing.

Figure 8. I suspect that the vertical axis is missing the “N”, as this is what all the units are in for the rest of the paper.

Line 12 p 252: “small biases –4—1”, this looks a little awkward with the all the dashes.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 241, 2012.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

