Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, C49–C50, 2012
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/12/C49/2012/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Emissions halted of the potent greenhouse gas SF_5CF_3" *by* W. T. Sturges et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 31 January 2012

This is a succinct, carefully written, and complete manuscript. The authors capture the issue and address details sufficiently for the reader to understand the message on first time through. Nice – I don't see that often. I recommend publication without significant change.

Suggested alterations:

Title: Since this manuscript is on a report on emissions, per se, but rather a top down view of what the end result looks like, the authors may want to insert the word "apparent" in the title. Emissions are deduced from observations here, not directly measured.

Abstract: The authors addressed "what we did, why it's important, what we found, and what it means" and did it in as few sentences as possible. No changes recommended.

Introduction: All good.

Methods: page 5, line 3. Stating “the” GasPro column suggests that the authors had described it already, but I don’t see that. Page 5, line 5. “time trend” is redundant. “trend” says it all. Pages 5-6, section on atmospheric modeling. I’m not too sure that a 2D model was necessary for this analysis; it seems like overkill for such a long-lived compound. Back of the envelope, global mass balance works fine and gets the same result. Page 6, line 7. “time trend” again.

Results: Page 7, line 1. “time period” – again, redundant. Page 9, line 21, ff. the aircraft latitudinal gradient gives strength to the overall case. Are there other surface sites to put in with this?

Conclusion: All good.

Figures: All informative.

Nice work.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 869, 2012.